

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert H. Stevenson to be assistant sanitary engineer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard J. Woodbridge to be passed assistant dental surgeon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 16, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 15 (legislative day of November 12), 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

R. Henry Norweb to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

REGULAR CORPS

To be assistant sanitary engineer

Albert H. Stevenson

To be passed assistant dental surgeon
Howard J. Woodbridge

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Chaplain Sheridan W. Bell, of the U. S. S. *Card* of the United States Navy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God we lift our human hearts to Thee this day, conscious of the scrutiny of Thy judging spirit. We know that we have failed miserably as we confront Thy standards of generosity, of mercy, of compassion. O God forgive us for our faults and errors. Turn not from us, but as with Thy children in the past, forgive us and establish our feet again upon the way that will lead us out of this wilderness of war and distrust, of envy and greed.

Bless the homes of our Nation where the people are paying the bitter price for this war. Watch over every home, every fighting man. May the spirit of peace prevail. May wars cease and all men come home to loved ones and reestablish their destiny with freedom.

May Thy blessing be with our Congress. Enable the leadership of our Nation to rise to tremendous heights of dignity and responsibility. May measures destined to elevate men to security and peace, flower in these Halls. Bring confidence to a Nation—to a world that is confused and baffled by the conflict of good with evil. In the name of the Great Leader, in Christ's name, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, November 13, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on November 12, 1943, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On November 12, 1943:

H. R. 3366. An act to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., November 14, 1943, entitled "Consumers Save Eighty-Nine Billion Dollars Through Price Control, O. P. A. Claim."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram I received from the State Senate Committee in California after their investigation of the Tule Lake section where the Japanese are housed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PENICILLIN

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, radio news casters, especially those who have a national audience, ought to scrupulously follow the rule of giving the people accurate information. Mr. Walter Winchell, in his news cast last night, violently offended this rule of accuracy, but not intentionally, I am sure.

In view of the national interest in the subject, a correction is in order. Mr. Winchell in his broadcast last night made the following statement regarding the famous penicillin drug:

To the family in Des Moines, Iowa, which requested penicillin for their boy, I am very sorry but the appeal must be made only to the War Department, which controls the magic drug. The request must come from the family, not an outsider.

The truth is that application should not be made to the Army but to a civilian doctor in Boston, and the application should not be made by the family but by

the attending physician of the patient, who is acquainted with the case. Penicillin is a very scarce and precious drug and is made available to civilians only in rare cases—thus far in about 794 cases—and only in cases where the attending physician can convince Dr. Chester Keefer, Evans Memorial Hospital, Boston, that the drug will prove helpful. Obviously, the family would have no conception of the efficacy of this drug. Mr. Winchell was 100 percent in error, and he will, by giving careless misinformation to the public, no doubt, heap upon the busy War Department an additional burden of correspondence, a thing which I know Mr. Winchell did not intend to do.

Penicillin has already saved many lives, including the lives of many men in our armed forces, and it will play an increasingly important part in the coming months. In view of the tremendous public interest in penicillin, I should like to make some further reference to it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD with further reference to this interesting and important subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MAJ. JOHN L. JERSTAD

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last week I called the attention of the House to an award of a Congressional Medal of Honor to a young air hero, Maj. John L. Jerstad, of Racine, Wis. I rise now to put into the RECORD this morning the citation contained with this medal of honor. It is as follows:

CITATION FOR THE MEDAL OF HONOR

Maj. John L. Jerstad, O-435784, Air Corps, United States Army. For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty. On August 1, 1943, he served as pilot of the lead aircraft in his group in a daring low-level attack against the enemy oil refineries and installations at Ploesti, Rumania. Although he had completed more than his share of missions and was no longer connected with this group, so high was his conception of duty that he volunteered to lead the formation in the correct belief that his participation would contribute materially to success in this attack. He led the formation into attack with full realization of the extreme hazards involved and despite withering fire from heavy and light antiaircraft guns. Three miles from the target his plane was hit, badly damaged, and set on fire. Ignoring the fact he was flying over a field suitable for a forced landing, he kept on the course. After the bombs of his aircraft were released on the target, the fire in his ship became so intense as to make further progress impossible, and he crashed into the target area. By his voluntary acceptance of a mis-

sion he knew was extremely hazardous, and his assumption of an intrepid course of action at the risk of life over and above the call of duty, Major Jerstad set an example of heroism which will be an inspiration to the armed forces of the United States.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business today and other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMANENT MEDICAL CORPS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and include as a part of my remarks a bill I recently introduced to create a permanent medical corps in the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a news article, relating to Capt. Sam Logan, depicting a typical example of Kansas courage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the legislative program and any prior special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRICE OF CRUDE OIL

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement by Mr. Otto Donnell, of the Ohio Oil Co., to Senator TAFT, on the subject of the price of crude oil.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, something like 140 names are on the petition to discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from consideration of the bill which involves fixing the price of crude oil. The statement I have just been granted permission to place in the Record deals with this subject in detail. It comes from a man of reliable information and goes into detail on this entire subject. It would be well worth your while to read it if you care to go thoroughly into the necessity for a raise in the price of crude oil, for the special reason involved in the growing shortage of crude oil.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

PACIFIC COAST JAPANESE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the care, custody, and control of the Pacific coast Japanese, particularly the 15,000 who openly manifest their disloyalty, should have been under the jurisdiction of the United States Army from the beginning. The Army would see to it that they are properly housed, clothed, and fed, and at the same time it would have prevented the disgraceful reign of terror that has existed at Tule Lake, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, I have received the following telegram and urge its recommendation be carried out:

After a complete investigation and hearing held in the Tule Lake section, the California State Senate Fact Finding Committee on Japanese Resettlement unanimously recommend and urge that Army control be maintained permanently at the Tule Lake Japanese segregation camp. We feel this is imperative for protection of the people of the State of California.

HUGH P. DONNELLY, *Chairman*,
HERBERT W. SLATER.
IRWIN T. QUINN.
GEORGE J. HATFIELD.
JESS R. DORSEY.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California, has expired.

THE LATE PVT. JOE P. MARTINEZ

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I read in the Well of this House the record of two boys from my own home city who were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. Today, I want to place in the Record the story of a young Spanish-American boy who lives just 18 miles east of my home, who was awarded posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor.

To Pvt. Joe P. Martinez, 23, of Ault, Colo., went the Nation's highest honor—the Congressional Medal of Honor. It was awarded posthumously, for Martinez, a former farm laborer, was killed in leading an American battalion to victory in a charge up the snow-covered mountains of Attu Island.

Martinez was a member of a battalion which had been trying for several days to drive the Japs from a key defensive position on Attu, but the attacks bogged down in the face of heavy machine-gun, rifle, and mortar fire.

"In the face of the severe hostile fire," declared the citation with the Medal of Honor, "Private Martinez arose to his feet and alone resumed his advance. Occasionally he stopped to urge his comrades on and his example inspired the others to follow."

He reached a plateau and cleaned out several Jap fox holes with hand grenades and his automatic rifle. The troops accompanying him drove on, but again the attack bogged down under heavy Jap fire from protected positions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in

the Record and include this entire article which appeared in the Washington Post, November 12, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SHORTAGE OF LIVESTOCK

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I have two letters—one from a prominent attorney, rancher, and oilman in the vicinity of Amarillo, Tex., in which he says that under date of November 8 he was offered one hundred 6 weeks' old pigs gratis by a farmer who had no feed and wanted to get rid of the pigs.

At Breckenridge, Mich., last week, at the livestock auction, pigs of a similar age sold across the block at 10 cents each for immediate delivery.

From the sheep-growing regions of Colorado and Utah I have letters from men affiliated with the industry there who tell me that their conditions of operation are becoming almost impossible. So we can well wonder where the meat supply required for this Nation and our friends is coming from in the months to come.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in New York, last Saturday, I learned that the Democratic leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], was keeping the House in session for the transaction of business that day. So I hurried back to attend the session, because I am always in favor of action. Coming on the floor I made the comment that I noticed that the Republican committee for action was not present. I soon learned that I was in error, that members of that committee were present and that the absentees belonged over on the majority side, and that this action of the Democratic majority leader in calling a Saturday session was just a bluff; that he did not really want to do any business anyway, and as soon as opportunity offered I tried to get a quorum to do business and the gentleman from Massachusetts moved for an adjournment, and he put it through and so we adjourned. The majority apparently does not want remedial legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the New York Times written by Hon. Harold G. Aron.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein resolutions of the Farm Bureau of Appanoose County.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Turtle Lake Local of the Barron County Wisconsin Farmers' Union with regard to the point values placed upon butter in comparison with oleomargarine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for today may be transferred to tomorrow to follow other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INCREASE OF WORLD WAR VETERANS' PENSIONS FROM \$40 TO \$50 PER MONTH

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution for printing on the bill (H. R. 3377) to increase the rate of pensions of World War veterans from \$40 to \$50 and for other purposes (Rept. No. 861), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3377) to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from \$40 to \$50 per month, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have three requests: One, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Ernie Pyle to his home newspaper; second, to include in the RECORD an address by the Honorable Huston Thompson at the tomb of Woodrow Wilson on Armistice Day; and, third, to include portions of an article by Judge John J. Parker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and

to include therein an editorial about lend-lease.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WILLKIE'S VIEWS ON LABOR

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wendell Willkie on November 13 in addressing the Milwaukee County Republican Party warned them that an anti-labor attitude on the part of the Republican Party would lead to its defeat in 1944. He stated that he would "fight every step of the way against any such foolish course." This significant statement indicates that he fears that the party will be dominated by those who are inimical to labor, otherwise why would he consider it necessary to fight against such leadership?

The Democratic Party has always given evidence of its confidence in the leadership of organized labor. Its attitude is that if the shackles which have hampered labor from obtaining its just rights were removed labor itself could be trusted to work for the best interests of America. The Republican Party, on the other hand, has been suspicious of labor, has protested against labor being given too much power, has felt that labor leadership would, if it could, wreck our economy. It all depends upon whether you believe in democracy or not and whether you trust the common people. Mr. Willkie apparently has reason to believe that the Republican leadership does not have this confidence in the Americans who work for a living.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter I wrote to Judge Vinson.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WILLKIE'S VIEWS ON LABOR

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, once again I want to console the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT], who has just spoken, and to remind him that he need not take seriously anything that Wendell Willkie says or does. His recent abuse of the white people of the South and his slurring remarks about the head of one of our Allied Nations was sufficient to finish him.

I am reminded in this connection of a funeral oration an old fellow made over the remains of one of his neighbors. They did not have a preacher, so they called on the justice of the peace to

preach the funeral. He walked up to the brink of the grave, pointed down at the coffin, and said, "Brethren, this corpse has been a member of our church for nearly 20 years."

Let me remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania that Mr. Willkie is not a member of the Democratic Party, and that, politically, he is already dead.

If I were preaching his political funeral I would say, "This corpse has been a member of the Republican Party for nearly 4 years."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 355)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am happy to inform the Congress that on November 9, 1943, representatives of 43 nations and peoples joined with our own Government in signing the accompanying U. N. R. A. Agreement, setting up an International Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to give first aid in the liberated areas. This agreement provides only the framework. The implementation is left to the constitutional law-making body of the member states.

The task of the organization will be to assist in furnishing the medicine, food, clothing, and other basic necessities and essential services which are required to restore the strength of the liberated peoples. They have been deliberately stripped by the enemy in order to support the Axis war machine. More than that, the Axis leaders have boasted that as they withdraw, they will leave only devastation—what they have not stolen, they will destroy. As our American soldiers fight their way up the Italian boot, they are discovering at first hand that the barbarism of the Nazis is equal to their boasts. Their only rivals in this respect are the Japanese.

U. N. R. A. will be able to make only a beginning in the vast task of aiding the victims of war. The greatest part of the job will have to be done by the liberated peoples themselves. What U. N. R. A. can do is to help the liberated peoples to help themselves, so that they may have the strength to undertake the task of rebuilding their destroyed homes, their ruined factories and their plundered farms.

The length of the war may be materially shortened if, as we free each occupied area, the people are enlisted in support of the United Nations' armies.

Already, for example, a new French Army has been created and, as we strike toward Berlin, increasing numbers in Sicily and Italy are falling in step beside the soldiers of the United Nations. Others construct roads and military installations required for our military operations. Millions more are waiting for the

moment when they, too, can strike a blow against the enemy.

They do not want charity. They seek the strength to fight, and to do their part in securing the peace. Aid to the liberated peoples during the war is thus a matter of military necessity as well as of humanity.

U. N. R. R. A. will not, of course, be expected to solve the long-range problems of reconstruction. Other machinery and other measures will be necessary for this purpose. What U. N. R. R. A. can do is to lay the necessary foundation for these later tasks of reconstruction.

The devastation and disorganization caused by the Nazi and Japanese war machines is so great that this world disaster can be met only by the united action of the 44 United Nations and associated nations. Accordingly, under the agreement establishing U. N. R. R. A., it is proposed that each nation will contribute in accordance with its ability. Each will determine for itself the amount and character of the contribution which it can make.

A small fraction of the national income of the contributing member states will, it is hoped, be sufficient to meet the needs. Some of the liberated nations may be able to make payment for the supplies and services rendered. But only by bringing to bear the resources of all the United Nations will we be able to relieve a substantial part of the suffering of the millions who will need help.

The nature and the amount of the contribution to be made by the United States will, in accordance with the terms of the U. N. R. R. A. agreement, be determined by the Congress of the United States under its constitutional procedure.

At this time I recommend to the Congress the enactment of a bill authorizing the appropriation of funds as Congress may from time to time determine to permit the participation by the United States in the work of U. N. R. R. A. I am not now recommending the appropriation of a specific sum. At a later date after the conclusion of the Atlantic City meeting, I shall send to you a further recommendation, informing you of the result of the meeting and requesting the appropriation of specific funds.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 15, 1943.

ELECTION CONTEST—SEVENTH ILLINOIS DISTRICT: MORELAND VERSUS SCHUETZ

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Elections, No. 3, and ordered printed:

NOVEMBER 15, 1943.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, James C. Moreland against Leonard W. Schuetz, notice of which has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the

House; and also transmit herewith original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto.

In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act relating to contested-election cases," the Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in the above case, and such portions of the testimony as the parties in interest agreed upon or as seemed proper to the Clerk, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed together with the notice of contest, and the answer thereto and original papers and exhibits have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections.

Two copies of the printed testimony in the aforesaid case have been mailed to the contestant and the same number to the contestee which, together with the briefs of the parties, will be laid before the Committee on Elections to which the case shall be referred.

Yours respectfully,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

The Clerk called the first bill on the calendar (S. 1242) to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2901, to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. COLE of New York, KEAN, and CUNNINGHAM objected.

APPOINTMENT OF A NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL JEFFERSON BICENTENARY COMMITTEE

The Clerk called the next business, Senate Joint Resolution 47, providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] has an amendment to offer which will do away with a great many of the whereases and greatly improve the bill. If that is done, I have no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to hear the amendment which the gentleman has and which he will offer.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], who has handled this joint resolution in the past, has asked me to present for him the amendment which I understand has been previously submitted to the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment would strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the purpose of this joint resolution is to authorize, during the year beginning April 13, 1943, which marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, the creation of the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee which, together with public and private institutions in the service of agriculture, the United States Department of Agriculture and the State colleges of agriculture and organizations composed of farmers and their families, is hereby authorized to hold, conduct, and participate in ceremonies and activities throughout the Nation not only to revere Thomas Jefferson as a patriotic statesman and philosopher, as author of the Declaration of Independence, as a private citizen and President of the United States but also in recognition of our great debt to him as a farmer, agricultural philosopher, inventive genius, educator and leader in scientific agriculture.

SEC. 2. That there be created the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby appointed chairman of and is hereby authorized to organize such Committee. The President pro tempore of the Senate shall appoint as members of the Committee five Members of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint as members of the Committee five Members of the House of Representatives. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to appoint in his discretion an appropriate number of members of the Committee representing the following agricultural organizations:

United States Department of Agriculture.
The land-grant colleges (including the colleges of agriculture, the agricultural experiment stations, and the agricultural extension services.)

National farm organization.
The agricultural press.
Scientific and learned societies dealing with agriculture.

The Office of Education.
The Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to appoint a secretary for the Committee. All members of the Committee to serve without compensation. The duties of the Committee shall be to assist in bringing to the attention of the people of the United States the great services rendered by Jefferson to agriculture and to encourage and promote appropriate and timely activities in connection with the various agricultural organizations mentioned above and the States of the United States in the various agricultural meetings to be held during the current year, to encourage appropriate programs dealing with Jefferson and agriculture in the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, to encourage widespread dissemination through the press, the radio, farmers' meetings, the rural schools and agricultural high schools, and so forth, information about Jefferson.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this joint resolution shall not be construed to authorize the

making of any appropriation to carry out its purpose.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, with that amendment, I have no objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the year of our Lord 1943 marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has set aside the year 1943 as a year of celebration of this important event by appropriate ceremonies and activities throughout the Nation; and

Whereas Congress has created the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson; and

Whereas Thomas Jefferson is revered as a patriotic statesman and philosopher, as author of the Declaration of Independence, for his services as a citizen of Virginia, as President of the United States, as a man of abiding passion for human liberty and the sacred rights of the common people, and as one who, throughout his entire career, remained preeminently and above all a farmer, devoted to the cultivation of his farms and the improvement of agriculture; and

Whereas he was one of the leading farmers of his time in the United States and was profoundly interested in the sciences related to agriculture and more than any other one person can be regarded as the father and patron of the scientific agricultural developments since his time; and

Whereas he practiced rotations of crops and diversified farming; introduced and improved the breeding of domestic animals and plants; contributed to the improvement of farm implements, such as the plow; encouraged the growing and use of fruits, vegetables, and other domestic products; encouraged research as to methods of control of insect pests; practiced and advocated control of soil erosion, and stood for the conservation of agricultural resources; and

Whereas as the founder of the University of Virginia, he made provision for a professorship of agriculture and helped start a train of events which led to the creation of agricultural colleges, experiment stations, and the research, educational, and other services of the Federal Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas, in his first administration as President of the United States, the national domain was enlarged by the acquisition of the Louisiana Territory, a great farming area which gave us a leading position in the agriculture of the world and enables us to serve as a source of food for our fighting allies; and

Whereas throughout his whole social philosophy runs a theme which recognizes the dignity of the agricultural way of life and a deep appreciation of the satisfactions which accrue, through science, education, and faith, to the farm-family and the rural community; and

Whereas he recognized the importance of the perpetuation of a sound agriculture as a paramount factor in the development of the economy and the permanence of our national institutions; and

Whereas, by reason of his contributions to agricultural philosophy, science, education,

farm management, and practice, he is recognized as one of the great leaders among the farmers of this country, who are now engaged in a vital part of the war effort; and

Whereas, as a figure, against the background of the soil of the land he loved, he stands as a symbol of its values, democracy and freedom, for the preservation of which the American farmers and all connected with the industry of agriculture are now contributing their maximum effort; and

Whereas it is appropriate that his services to agriculture should be duly recognized and brought to public attention in this anniversary year; and

Whereas many public and private institutions in the service of agriculture, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the State colleges of agriculture and organizations composed of farmers and their families are anxious to participate in activities in recognition of our great debt to Jefferson as a farmer, agricultural philosopher, statesman, and educator and leader in scientific agriculture; Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That there be created, under the auspices of and in cooperation with the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby appointed Chairman of and is hereby authorized to organize such committee. The President pro tempore of the Senate shall appoint as members of the committee five Members of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint as members of the committee five Members of the House of Representatives. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to appoint in his discretion an appropriate number of members of the committee representing the following agricultural organizations:

United States Department of Agriculture.
The land-grant colleges (including the colleges of agriculture, the agricultural experiment stations, and the agricultural extension services).

National farm organizations.
The agricultural press.
Scientific and learned societies dealing with agriculture.

The Office of Education.
The Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to appoint a secretary for the committee. All members of the committee are to serve without compensation. The duties of the committee shall be to assist in bringing to the attention of the people of the United States the great services rendered by Jefferson to agriculture and to encourage and promote appropriate and timely activities in connection with the agricultural aspects of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, in the various agricultural meetings to be held during the current year, to encourage appropriate programs dealing with Jefferson and agriculture in the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, to encourage widespread dissemination through the press, the radio, farmers' meetings, the rural schools and agricultural high schools, etc., information about Jefferson and to otherwise cooperate with the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, after line 23, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 2. The provisions of this joint resolution shall not be construed to authorize the making of any appropriation to carry out its purpose."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the purpose of this resolution is to authorize, during the year beginning April 13, 1943, which marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, the creation of the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee which, together with public and private institutions in the service of agriculture, the United States Department of Agriculture and the State colleges of agriculture and organizations composed of farmers and their families, is hereby authorized to hold, conduct, and participate in ceremonies and activities throughout the Nation not only to revere Thomas Jefferson as a patriotic statesman and philosopher, as author of the Declaration of Independence, as a private citizen, and President of the United States, but also in recognition of our great debt to him as a farmer, agricultural philosopher, inventive genius, educator, and leader in scientific agriculture.

"Sec. 2. That there be created the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby appointed chairman of and is hereby authorized to organize such committee. The President pro tempore of the Senate shall appoint as members of the Committee five Members of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint as members of the Committee five Members of the House of Representatives. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to appoint in his discretion an appropriate number of members of the Committee representing the following agricultural organizations:

United States Department of Agriculture.
The land-grant colleges (including the colleges of agriculture, the agricultural experiment stations, and the agricultural extension services).

National farm organization.
The agricultural press.
Scientific and learned societies dealing with agriculture.

The Office of Education.
The Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to appoint a secretary for the committee. All members of the committee to serve without compensation. The duties of the committee shall be to assist in bringing to the attention of the people of the United States the great services rendered by Jefferson to agriculture and to encourage and promote appropriate and timely activities in connection with the various agricultural organizations mentioned above and the States of the United States in the various agricultural meetings to be held during the current year, to encourage appropriate programs dealing with Jefferson and agriculture in the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, to encourage widespread dissemination through the press, the radio, farmers' meetings, the rural schools, and agricultural high schools, etc., information about Jefferson.

"Sec. 3. The provisions of this joint resolution shall not be construed to authorize the making of any appropriation to carry out its purpose.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the

farmers and the agriculture of the Nation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, the title amended, and a motion to reconsider the vote on passage was laid on the table.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the bill just passed commemorates Thomas Jefferson, an outstanding early American, as one of the founding fathers, recognizing his place in agriculture as one of the several fields of activity in which he predominated. I have always been impressed with Jefferson's versatility, breadth of vision, and his insight into the part that science and art and the development of the human mind play in the greatness of a people. His basic political philosophy led inevitably to his stress on the education of each individual citizen, so much so that common schools and universal public education were a necessity in his political scheme of things.

While we want to remember all very worthy ones who have made their contribution toward establishing or preserving American life, it may be that we are too prone to remember the doers rather than the thinkers. I feel that we should watch with discrimination the things we stress, for before the doer there must be the thinker, before the builder there must be the planner. Thomas Jefferson filled both roles. Great as Jefferson was in the matter of his doing, he was greater in the matter of his thinking.

He certainly should be remembered for what he did, but his more fitting memorials are in the realm of the mind. I would have Jefferson remembered in a variety of ways, of course, because of the variation of his greatness, but I want to remember him for his emphasis upon the development of the human intellect and his freeing of the mind from the thralldom of ignorance.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The Clerk called the next bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 3377, to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from \$40 to \$50 per month, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand a rule has been granted on this bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN]?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have received from the Veterans' Administration an estimate of the cost of this bill. In order that the House may be advised of that estimate submitted by the Veterans' Administration, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Record at this point.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from New York that this bill will come up under a rule tomorrow and be discussed by members of the committee. I do not want him to take those figures as conclusive. The Veterans' Administration usually gives the outside figure whenever asked to make an estimate. I wanted to place that statement in the Record so that these figures might not go into the Record unchallenged.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. My only reason for doing this is that when the bill was called up on the last call of the Consent Calendar we inquired of the gentleman if he had an estimate of the cost, and he said he did not have it. Then I wrote to the Veterans' Administration, which is the logical place to get it.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from New York that I appeared before the Committee on Rules this morning and gave them that information. However, as I said a while ago, it is the custom of an administrative agency to give the outside figure, the ultimate limit of the cost of any measure concerning which they are called upon to make recommendations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. How much time for debate tomorrow on this bill is provided by the rule?

Mr. RANKIN. Two hours.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is an important measure and one which I favor. I hope the time allowed will permit the merits of the bill to be brought out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The estimate referred to follows:

(Estimate of cost on H. R. 3377, 78th Cong., a bill to increase the rate of pension for World War veterans from \$40 to \$50 per month, to \$60 per month in certain specified cases, and for other purposes, as reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation October 11, 1943, Rept. No. 747.)

The bill, as reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, would provide a rate of \$50 per month for veterans eligible to pension for permanent and total disability not shown to be due to service under part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, or \$60 monthly if the veteran shall have been rated permanently and totally disabled and in receipt of pension therefor for a continuous period of 10 years or has reached the age of 65 years and is permanently and totally disabled.

The estimated cost for the first year is \$12,768,000. Increases would be provided for approximately 81,000 World War No. 1 veterans and 200 Spanish-American War veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

INCREASE IN CERTAIN MONTHLY RATES OF COMPENSATION OR PENSION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3356, to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand this bill also has a rule providing for its consideration and will be called up in the next day or so. As in the case of the bill called just before this one, I have an estimate from the Veterans' Administration as to the cost of this measure, and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Record at this point.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from New York that I appeared before the Committee on Rules this morning asking for a rule on this bill, and gave the information the gentleman is giving the House now. I also call attention to the fact that when the Veterans' Administration is called upon to make an estimate of the cost of a measure, it usually gives the outside figure, so we do not take those figures at face value as being correct as to what the measure would cost.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman will recall that years ago when I asked for figures from the Veterans' Administration as to the cost of a bill they were millions of dollars high in their estimate of the cost.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They admitted later that they were wrong in their estimate.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I asked for a rule on this bill along with the gentleman from Mississippi, and it was unanimously reported from the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, appeared with me before the Committee on Rules this morning and asked for rules on both these bills, H. R. 3377 and H. R. 3356. As the gentlewoman has said, the estimates that are given as to the outside cost of measures pending before Congress, especially with reference to veterans' legislation, have often proved to

be very, very much exaggerated compared with what the actual costs were when put to the test, so I would not want the statement to go in the RECORD that we concede that this will be the cost of this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

The estimate referred to follows:

(Estimate of cost on H. R. 3356, 78th Cong., "A bill to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, 73d Cong., as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act," as reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation October 11, 1943, Rept. No. 749.)

ESTIMATED COST FIRST YEAR

Section 1, as amended, provides that the monthly amount of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates under Public, 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, for service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including the special awards and allowances fixed by law, shall be increased by 15 percent.

It is estimated that this section would provide increases to approximately 329,100 veterans the first year at an additional cost of \$22,247,000.

Section 2 provides increases in monthly rates of compensation payable under Public Law No. 484, as amended. It would increase the widow's rate from \$30 to \$35, and the widow with 1 child, additional amount for the child to be increased from \$8 to \$10 per month (additional children increased from \$4 to \$5 per month); no widow but 1 child would be increased from \$15 to \$18 per month; no widow but 2 children increased from \$22 (equally divided) to \$27 (equally divided) per month; no widow but 3 children increased from \$30 (equally divided) to \$36 (equally divided) per month; and the amount for additional children would be increased from \$3 to \$4 per month for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).

It is estimated the widows and children of approximately 33,500 deceased veterans would be entitled to the increased rates the first year at a cost of \$2,526,000.

Section 3 provides the increases authorized by this bill shall be effective from the 1st day of the first month following the passage of this act.

Section 4 of this amended bill would extend the benefits of Public Law No. 484, as amended, to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war where death is not service connected but at time of death the veteran had a service-connected disability. Because the rate of deaths from other than service-connected disabilities would probably be small for veterans of this war who have been discharged from service and because in many of the cases that could otherwise qualify, the veteran does not leave an eligible beneficiary, it is thought the cost of this section would be small the first year. Therefore no estimate for the first year is submitted. However, there would be a materially increasing cost dependent upon the number of service-connected disabilities of this war.

The total estimated cost of this bill the first year will approximate \$24,773,000.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NAVY NURSE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2976, to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION OF DEPENDENTS AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS OF PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1336, to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and the reserve components thereof when on active duty, of grades entitling them to transportation of dependents and household effects on change of station (a) when on duty at places designated by the Secretary of the Navy as within zones from which their dependents should be evacuated for military reasons or for the purpose of relieving congestion in the vicinity of naval activities or where Government quarters for their dependents are not available; (b) or upon transfer or assignment of such officers and enlisted men to sea duty, as such duty may be defined by the Secretary of the Navy; (c) or upon transfer or assignment of such officers and enlisted men to duty at places where their dependents for military reasons are not permitted to join them or where Government quarters for their dependents are not available, may, upon application of such personnel or their dependents, be allowed, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, transportation for their dependents and household effects, including packing, crating, and unpacking thereof, from their stations or places of storage in the United States to any other points in the United States, and from such points to new stations in the United States to which such personnel may be subsequently ordered for duty, and at which their dependents are not restricted from joining them or Government quarters for their dependents are available.

SEC. 2. Whenever the Chief of Naval Personnel, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Commandant of the Coast Guard, or such subordinates as they may designate, certify that the personnel included in (b) and (c) of section 1 hereof have been transferred to sea duty or to duty at places beyond the continental limits of the United States where their dependents for military reasons are not permitted to join them, the wives of such personnel, or such other responsible persons as may be designated by the officials named above in this section, may execute such certificates as may be required and which are filed with, and relate to, vouchers in connection with the transportation of dependents or household effects: *Provided*, That in lieu of copies of orders of such personnel, the certificate above

provided for shall constitute authority for such transportation of dependents, and household effects as may be authorized hereunder and any certificate or certification authorized by this act shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government: *And provided further*, That, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, claims for reimbursement may be submitted by and payments made to personnel concerned or their dependents for any authorized travel performed by dependents at their own expense.

SEC. 3. The Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers in cases where such dependents would have been entitled to transportation if the provisions of section 1 hereof had been in effect on the date of payment for otherwise proper payments heretofore made to transportation of dependents, or reimbursement therefor, under orders issued prior to the effective date of this act, to the extent of the commercial cost of transportation of the dependents from the old duty station to the new duty station. Such cost of transportation shall be computed from the last available published rates on the date the orders involved were issued.

SEC. 4. Transportation of household effects of naval and civilian personnel of the Naval Establishment, as now or hereafter authorized by law, may, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe, be by means of rail, water, or van, without regard to comparative costs.

SEC. 5. This act shall be effective as of December 7, 1941, and shall remain in effect for the duration of the present wars and for 6 months after the termination of such wars, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1354, to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy," approved January 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1092; 34 U. S. C. 1073-1073e), is amended by inserting therein a new section numbered 4A, reading as follows:

"SEC. 4A. Each civilian member of the teaching staffs who is hereafter retired on or after reaching the age of retirement set forth in section 3 of this act shall be paid a life annuity, terminable on his death, at the rate of the following total annual amount: The average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by such civilian teacher during any 5 consecutive years of allowable service at the option of such teacher, multiplied by the number of years of service, not exceeding 35 years, and divided by 70. The retirement annuity payable to each such retired teacher, under any annuity policy provided for by this act, or under the provisions of section 4 of this act, shall be counted as payable on account of the retirement annuity provided in this section 4A, and the Secretary

of the Navy shall pay to each such retired teacher, from such appropriations as may be made for the purpose, such additional sums, if any, as will bring the total annual sum paid to such retired teacher to the total annual amount prescribed in this section 4A: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall operate to reduce the retirement annuity which would have been payable to any such retired teacher if this section had not been enacted: *And provided further*, That no payments under this section shall be made to any member of said staffs who shall be entitled to retirement and retirement benefits under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1920, as amended, and shall elect, or shall have elected, to continue thereunder."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the said act of January 16, 1936, is hereby amended by striking out the word "and" before the word "professors," and by striking out the period after said word "professors," and by adding after said word a comma, followed by the words "and senior professors."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BELLE FOURCHE RIVER COMPACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2580, to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to a compact authorized by the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of South Dakota and Wyoming with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Belle Fourche and Cheyenne Rivers and other streams in which such States are jointly interested," approved February 26, 1927 (44 Stat. 1247), signed by commissioners for the States of South Dakota and Wyoming, on the 18th day of February 1943, and thereafter ratified by the act of the Legislature of South Dakota entitled "An act ratifying and approving a compact between the States of Wyoming and South Dakota for use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River, and declaring an emergency," approved March 4, 1943, and the act of the Legislature of Wyoming entitled "An act to provide for the ratification and approval of the Belle Fourche River compact," approved March 3, 1943, which compact reads as follows:

"BELLE FOURCHE RIVER COMPACT

"The States of South Dakota and Wyoming, parties signatory to this compact (hereinafter referred to as South Dakota and Wyoming, respectively, or individually as a State, or collectively as the States), have resolved to conclude a compact as authorized under the act of Congress of February 26, 1927 (ch. 216, 44 Stat. 1247), and after negotiations participated in by the following-named State commissioners:

"For South Dakota: M. Q. Sharpe, G. W. Morsman, S. G. Mortimer, W. D. Buchholz.

"For Wyoming: L. C. Bishop, Samuel McKean, L. H. Robinson, Mrs. E. E. McKean, and by Howard R. Stinson, appointed as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles, to wit:

"ARTICLE I

"A. The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the most efficient use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin (hereinafter referred to as the Basin) for multiple purposes; to provide for an equitable division of such waters; to remove all causes, present and future, which might lead to controversies; to promote interstate comity; to recognize that the most efficient utilization of the waters within the Basin is required for the full development of the Basin; and to promote joint action by the States and the United States in the efficient use of water and the control of floods.

"B. The physical and other conditions peculiar to the Basin constitute the basis for this compact; and none of the States hereby, nor the Congress of the United States by its consent, concedes that this compact establishes any general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream.

"C. Either State and all others using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River under the authority of that State, shall be subject to the terms of this compact.

"ARTICLE II

"As used in this compact—

"A. The term 'Belle Fourche River' shall mean and include the Belle Fourche River and all its tributaries originating in Wyoming.

"B. The term 'Basin' shall mean that area in South Dakota and Wyoming which is naturally drained by the Belle Fourche River, and all its tributaries.

"C. The term 'beneficial use' is herein defined to be that use by which the water supply of a drainage basin is depleted when usefully employed by the activities of man, and includes water lost by evaporation, and other natural causes from streams, canals, ditches, irrigated areas, and reservoirs.

"D. Where the name of the State or the term 'State' or 'States' is used, these shall be construed to include any person or entity of any nature whatsoever using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River under the authority of that State.

"ARTICLE III

"It shall be the duty of the two States to administer this compact through the official in each State who is now or may hereafter be charged with the duty of administering the public water supplies, and to collect and correlate through such officials the data necessary for the proper administration of the provisions of this compact. Such officials may, by unanimous action, adopt rules and regulations consistent with the provisions of this compact.

"The United States Geological Survey, or whatever Federal agency may succeed to the functions and duties of that agency, insofar as this compact is concerned, shall collaborate with the officials of the States charged with the administration of this compact in the execution of the duty of such officials in the collection, correlation, and publication of information necessary for the proper administration of this compact.

"ARTICLE IV

"Each State shall itself or in conjunction with other responsible agencies cause to be established, maintained, and operated such suitable water gaging stations as it finds necessary to administer this compact.

"ARTICLE V

"A. Wyoming and South Dakota agree that the unappropriated waters of the Belle Fourche River as of the date of this compact shall be allocated to each State as follows:

"Ninety percent to South Dakota, 10 percent to Wyoming: *Provided*, That allocations to Wyoming shall be exclusive of the use of

these waters for domestic and stock use, and Wyoming shall be allowed unrestricted use for these purposes, except that no reservoir for such use shall exceed 20 acre-feet in capacity. For storage of its allocated water, Wyoming shall have the privilege of purchasing at cost not to exceed 10 percent of the total storage capacity of any reservoir or reservoirs constructed in Wyoming for irrigation of lands in South Dakota, or may construct reservoirs itself for the purpose of utilizing such water. Either State may temporarily divert, or store for beneficial use, any unused part of the above percentages allotted to the other, but no continuing right shall be established thereby.

"B. Rights to the use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River, whether based on direct diversion or storage, are hereby recognized as of the date of this compact to the extent these rights are valid under the law of the State in which the use is made, and shall remain unimpaired hereby. These rights, together with the additional allocations made under A of this article, are agreed to be an equitable apportionment between the States of the waters of the basin.

"C. The waters allocated under A of this article and the rights recognized under B of this article are hereinafter referred to collectively as the apportioned water. For the purposes of the administration of this compact and determining the apportioned water at any given date within a given calendar year, there shall be taken the sum of:

"(1) The quantity of water in acre-feet that passed the Wyoming-South Dakota State line during the period from January 1 of that year to that given date.

"(2) The quantity of water in acre-feet in storage on that date in all reservoirs built in Wyoming on the Belle Fourche River subsequent to the date of this compact.

"ARTICLE VI

"Any person, entity, or State shall have the right to acquire necessary property rights in another State, by purchase or through the exercise of the power of eminent domain for the construction, operation, and maintenance of storage reservoirs and of appurtenant works, canals, and conduits required for the enjoyment of the privileges granted by article V and article VII A: *Provided, however*, That the grantees of such rights shall pay to the political subdivisions of the State in which such works are located, each and every year during which such rights are enjoyed for such purposes, a sum of money equivalent to the average annual amount of taxes assessed against the lands and improvements thereon during the 10 years preceding the use of such lands in reimbursement for the loss of taxes to said political subdivision of the State.

"ARTICLE VII

"A. Either State shall have the right, by compliance with the laws of the other State, to file applications for and receive permits to construct or participate in the construction and use of any dam, storage reservoir, or diversion works in such State for the purpose of conserving and regulating the apportioned water of the other State: *Provided*, That such right is subject to the rights of the other State to control, regulate, and use water apportioned to it.

"B. Each claim hereafter initiated for storage or diversion of water in one State for use in another State shall be filed in the office of the State engineer of the State in which the water is to be stored or diverted, and a duplicate copy of the application including a map showing the character and location of the proposed facilities and the lands to be irrigated shall be filed in the office of the State engineer of the State in which the water is to be used. If a portion or all the lands proposed to be reclaimed are located in a State other than the one in

which the water is to be stored or diverted, then, before approval of the application shall be granted, said application shall be checked against the records of the appropriate office of the State in which the water is to be used, and a notation shall be placed thereon by the officer in charge of such records to the effect that the land description does not indicate a conflict with existing water rights. All endorsements shall be placed on both the original and duplicate copies of all such maps filed to the end that the records in both States may be complete and identical.

"C. Appropriations may hereafter be adjudicated in the State in which the water is stored or diverted, and where a portion or all of the lands irrigated are in the other State, such adjudications shall be confirmed in the latter State by the proper authority. Each adjudication is to conform with the laws of the State where the water is stored or diverted and shall be recorded in the county and State where the water is used.

"ARTICLE VIII

"In case any reservoir is constructed in Wyoming, to be used principally for irrigation of lands in South Dakota, sufficient water not to exceed 10 cubic feet per second shall be released at all times for stock water use.

"ARTICLE IX

"No reservoir hereafter built solely to utilize the water allocated to Wyoming shall have a capacity in excess of 1,000 acre-feet.

"ARTICLE X

"The provisions of this compact shall remain in full force and effect until amended by action of the legislatures of the States and consented to and approved by the Congress of the United States in the same manner as this compact is required to be ratified to become effective.

"ARTICLE XI

"This compact may be terminated at any time by unanimous consent of the States, and upon such termination, all rights then established hereunder or recognized hereby shall continue to be recognized as valid by the States notwithstanding the termination of the other provisions of the compact.

"ARTICLE XII

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or prevent either State from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal or equitable, in any Federal court or the United States Supreme Court for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

"ARTICLE XIII

"Nothing in this compact shall be deemed:

"A. To impair or affect any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in and to the use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River nor its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters;

"B. To subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities to taxation by either State or subdivision thereof, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payments to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes;

"C. To subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent to which these laws would apply without regard to the compact.

"ARTICLE XIV

"This compact shall become operative when approved by the legislature of each of the

States, and when consented to by the Congress of the United States by legislation providing, among other things, that:

"A. Any beneficial uses hereafter made by the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, within a State, of the waters allocated by this compact, shall be within the allocations hereinabove made for use in that State and shall be taken into account in determining the extent of use within that State.

"B. The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, in the exercise of rights or powers arising from whatever jurisdiction the United States has in, over, and to the waters of the Belle Fourche River and all its tributaries, shall recognize, to the extent consistent with the best utilization of the waters for multiple purposes, that beneficial use of the waters within the basin is of paramount importance to development of the basin, and no exercise of such power or right thereby that would interfere with the full beneficial use of the waters shall be made, except upon a determination, giving due consideration to the objectives of this compact and after consultation with all interested Federal agencies and the State officials charged with the administration of this compact, that such exercise is in the interest of the best utilization of such waters for multiple purpose.

"C. The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, will recognize any established use, for domestic and irrigation purposes, of the apportioned waters which may be impaired by the exercise of Federal jurisdiction in, over, and to such waters; provided, that such use is being exercised beneficially, is valid under the laws of the appropriate State and in conformity with this compact at the time of the impairment thereof, and was validly initiated under State law prior to the initiation or authorization of the Federal program or project which causes such impairment.

"ARTICLE XV

"Should a court of competent jurisdiction hold any part of this compact to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States, all other severable provisions shall continue in full force and effect.

"In witness whereof the commissioners have signed this compact in triplicate original, one of which shall be filed in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the States.

"Done at the city of Cheyenne in the State of Wyoming, this 18th day of February, in the year of our Lord, 1943.

"Commissioners for South Dakota:

"M. Q. SHARPE.
"G. W. MORSMAN.
"S. G. MORTIMER.
"W. D. BUCHHOLZ.

"Commissioners for Wyoming:

"L. C. BISHOP.
"SAMUEL MCKEAN.
"L. H. ROBINSON.
"Mrs. E. E. MCKEAN.

"I have participated in the negotiation of this compact and intend to report favorably thereon to the Congress of the United States.

"HOWARD R. STINSON,
"Representative of the United States
of America."

SEC. 2. (a) In order that the conditions stated in article XIV of the compact hereby consented to shall be met and that the compact shall be and continue to be operative, the following provisions are enacted:

(1) Any beneficial uses hereafter made by the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, within a State, of the waters allocated by such compact, shall be within

the allocations made by such compact for use in that State and shall be taken into account in determining the extent of use within that State;

(2) The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, in the exercise of rights or powers arising from whatever jurisdiction the United States has in, over, and to the waters of the Belle Fourche River and all its tributaries shall recognize, to the extent consistent with the best utilization of the waters for multiple purposes, that beneficial use of the waters within the basin is of paramount importance to the development of the basin; and no exercise of such power or right thereby that would interfere with the full beneficial use of the waters within the basin shall be made except when a determination, giving due consideration to the objectives of such compact and after consultation with all interested Federal agencies and the State officials charged with the administration of such compact, that such exercise is in the interest of the best utilization of such waters for multiple purposes;

(3) The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, will recognize any established use, for domestic and irrigation purposes, of the apportioned water which may be impaired by the exercise of Federal jurisdiction in, over, and to such water: *Provided*, That such use is being exercised beneficially, is valid under the laws of the appropriate State and in conformity with such compact at the time of the impairment thereof and was validly initiated under State law prior to the initiation or authorization of the Federal program or project which causes such impairment.

(b) As used in this section, the following terms: "beneficial use," "basin," and "apportioned water," shall have the same meanings as those ascribed to them in the compact consented to by this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the proposed compact provides for the division of the water supply of the Belle Fourche River between the States of Wyoming and South Dakota. The drainage basin of this river comprises an area of 7,350 square miles in northeastern Wyoming and western South Dakota. The main purpose of the compact is to make an equitable division of the waters of this basin for irrigation purposes and to provide the basis for the development of additional water storage in Wyoming. The compact will materially aid the development of the Belle Fourche project in South Dakota, inasmuch as it will remove any question as to the status of project water rights arising out of the absence of water filings in my State for this project. It was originally contemplated to irrigate 76,000 acres on this project, but it has been impossible to provide water for more than 40,000 acres. Under the terms of the compact all valid water rights in Wyoming are recognized and people of Wyoming are authorized to make unrestricted use of the water for stock and domestic use. Up to 10 second-

feet of water in the Belle Fourche below any reservoir to be constructed may be used for stock water in compact. Furthermore, Wyoming is assured the right to store and use up to 10 percent of all the water that falls in Wyoming on this watershed over and above presently appropriated water. This compact was ratified unanimously by the Legislature of Wyoming and with only one dissenting vote in the Legislature of South Dakota. The legislation has been approved by the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and War, and the Federal Power Commission has raised no objection to the bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2580 is a bill to protect the interests of the United States Government, the State of Wyoming, and the State of South Dakota. It gives the approval of the Congress to a pact already approved by the State Legislatures of Wyoming and South Dakota for a division of the waters of the Belle Fourche River.

The bill recognizes and confirms existing water appropriations. It establishes permanent stock-water rights for stockmen in Wyoming. It then provides for a division of the unused waters that will permit irrigation of all of the good irrigable lands that can be reached below a feasible dam site in Wyoming and that will provide a supplemental water supply for the existing Belle Fourche project in South Dakota.

The Federal Government has an investment of many millions of dollars in the Belle Fourche project. Additional water is needed to stabilize the development and settlement of the project. The reservoir which now stores water for the project is an off-stream reservoir and the inlet canal cannot carry enough volume to save all the floodwater in times of a high flood. Eventually it is hoped that a storage reservoir can be constructed in Wyoming, farther upstream, that will make possible irrigation of available lands in Wyoming and also provide some supplemental water for the downstream project in South Dakota.

The bill, H. R. 2580, was introduced by my able colleague, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] to give effect to a compact entered into by representatives of the Federal Government and the States of Wyoming and South Dakota. Already, the compact has been approved by the State legislatures unanimously, and the favorable action of the House today will be greatly appreciated by the people and water users in the States concerned.

RETURN TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN VESSELS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3261, to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels

of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto," approved April 29, 1943 (Public Law 44, 78th Cong., 57 Stat. 69), is amended to read as follows: "That any vessel formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto, any vessel of 1,000 gross tons (determined in accordance with the provisions of sec. 77 of title 46 of the United States Code) or less, and any vessel employed on the Great Lakes during the year preceding its acquisition by the United States, the title to which has been or may hereafter be acquired by the United States through purchase or requisition, may be returned to private ownership in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"Sec. 2. Every such vessel shall, upon determination by the department or agency having possession thereof that the vessel is no longer needed or can be spared by such department or agency without detriment to its service, be made available to the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration (hereinafter referred to as the Administrator), who shall notify the owner from whom such vessel was purchased or requisitioned that the vessel may be returned to such owner upon repayment to the United States of the compensation paid therefor less such allowances as the Administrator may deem reasonable (1) to cover the cost of such reconditioning as would be necessary to restore the vessel to a condition at least as good as when acquired by the United States (ordinary wear and tear excepted), and (2) to compensate such owner for the use of the vessel by the United States, and upon compliance with such other terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe. The determination of such allowances by the Administrator shall be final, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

"Sec. 3. If any such owner shall fail, within a reasonable time after notice (which time shall be specified in the notice but may be extended by the Administrator), to make arrangements satisfactory to the Administrator for such return of the vessel or shall expressly waive the right thereto, the Administrator may advertise the vessel for sale upon competitive sealed bids subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe. That the Administrator may reject any bid which does not equal the purchase price or compensation paid or payable by the United States for such vessel less a reasonable allowance to cover the cost of reconditioning as hereinabove defined.

"Sec. 4. The Administrator may withhold from the funds received for the return or sale of any such vessel the expenses incurred by him in such return or sale, and shall pay over the balance of such receipts to the department or agency by which such vessel was made available."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "requisition", insert "except any vessel 17 years of age or older traded in under the provisions of section 510, Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, or any other provision of law."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "would be" and insert in lieu thereof "the Administrator after consultation with the owner deems."

Page 2, line 20, strike out the words "a condition" and insert the words "condition and utility."

Page 3, line 3, after the word "owner", insert the words "to whom compensation has

been paid or a tender of compensation has been made."

Page 3, line 10, insert after the word "prescribe" a comma and the words: "including in the case of any vessel used in commercial fisheries or industries related thereto immediately prior to the acquisition of such vessel by the United States, a requirement that the vessel will not be used for a period of 2 years from date of sale, other than in the commercial fisheries or industries related thereto."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2641) to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to accept title to lands and interests in lands near the entrance to the Sequoia National Park, subject to existing easements for public highways and public utilities, within the following described tracts:

Tract A. A portion of tract 37, township 17 south, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Tulare County, Calif., comprising approximately 2 acres.

Tract B. A portion of the east half of the northeast quarter of section 4, township 17 south, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Tulare County, Calif., comprising approximately 38 acres.

Tract C. A portion of the south half of tract 37, township 17 south, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Tulare County, Calif., comprising approximately sixty one-hundredths acre.

The owners of the lands to be conveyed to the United States, before any exchange is effective, shall furnish to the Secretary of the Interior evidence satisfactory to him of title to such lands. Such property shall become a part of the Sequoia National Park upon the acceptance of title thereto by the Secretary, and shall thereafter be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the park.

Sec. 2. That in exchange for the conveyance to the United States of tract A, as provided in section 1 of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, to patent to the owner of tract A, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem necessary, certain lands of approximately equal value described as follows:

Tract D. A portion of the southeast quarter of section 33, township 16 south, range 29, east, Mount Diablo meridian, Tulare County, Calif., comprising approximately two and fifty one-hundredths acres.

In exchange for the conveyance of the United States of tracts B and C, as provided in section 1 of this act, the Secretary is authorized to patent, in a similar manner, to the owner of tracts B and C certain lands of approximately equal value described as follows:

Tract E. The southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 4, which shall be subject to section 24 of the Federal Power Act (16 U. S. C., sec. 818); the south half of the northeast quarter of section 5; and approximately 68 acres of the north half of the southeast quarter of section 5, which shall not include the surveyed 200-foot strip as shown on map D of exhibit K entitled "Detailed Map of Kaweah Project of the

Southern California Edison Co., Ltd.," and filed in the office of the Federal Power Commission on December 12, 1923; all of said lands in tract E being situated in township 17 south, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, comprising approximately 188 acres.

Sec. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to alter or affect in any manner the provisions, or extend the term, of the permit heretofore granted to the Southern California Edison Co., and predecessors thereof for the use of lands in the Sequoia National Park for electric power development purposes, or to relieve the company of any financial or other obligation under said permit, or under agreements or orders relating or supplementary thereto.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEASING OF COAL LANDS, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3428) to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. That each lease shall be for such leasing block or tract of land as may be offered or applied for, not exceeding in area 2,560 acres of land, to be described by the subdivisions of the survey, and no person, association, or corporation, except as hereinafter provided, shall take or hold at any one time leases for more than 2,560 acres in the aggregate, or take or hold any interest as a member of an association or stockholder of a corporation holding a lease under this act if the acreage represented by such indirect interest, or by such indirect interest together with the acreage represented by the direct holding of any lease issued under this act, exceeds 2,560 acres in the aggregate. Any interest held in violation of this act shall be forfeited to the United States by appropriate proceedings instituted by the Attorney General for that purpose in any court of competent jurisdiction, except that any ownership or interest forbidden in this act which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for 2 years, and not longer, after its acquisition.

"Sec. 7. That, except as herein provided, any person who shall purchase, acquire, or hold any interest in leases issued under this act, either directly or as a stockholder in a corporation or member of an association holding leases or interests in leases of which he has knowledge, which interest so purchased, acquired, or held shall exceed in the aggregate 2,560 acres, or who shall knowingly purchase, acquire, or hold any stock in a corporation or shares in an association which holds any interest in leases issued under this act exceeding 2,560 acres in the aggregate, or who shall knowingly sell or transfer to one disqualified to purchase, or, disqualified to acquire any such interest, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than 3 years or a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or both: *Provided*, That any such ownership and interest hereby forbidden which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held 2 years after its acquisition and not longer, and in case of

minority or other disability such time as the court may decree.

"Sec. 8. That any director, trustee, officer, or agent of any corporation or association holding an interest in such leases who shall, on behalf of such corporation or association, act in the purchase of any interest in any other lease, which together with the other holdings of the corporation or association under this act, exceeds 2,560 acres in the aggregate, or who shall knowingly act on behalf of such corporation or association in the sale or transfer of any such interest in any lease held by such corporation or association to any corporation, association, or individual holding any interest or interests in any other such leases which together with the interest sold or transferred exceeds in the aggregate 2,560 acres, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than 3 years or a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or both."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMS OF DISTRICT COURT, MIDDLE DISTRICT, TENNESSEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 630) to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective July 1, 1943, so much of the second sentence of section 107 (c) of the Judicial Code, as amended, as precedes the proviso is amended to read as follows: "Terms of the district court for the Nashville division of said district shall be held at Nashville on the fourth Monday in January and the fourth Monday in September; for the Columbia division at Columbia on the first Monday in May and the second Monday in November; and for the northeastern division at Cookeville on the second Monday in June and the first Monday in December."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "July 1, 1943" and insert "January 1, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN AWARDS, FOR WAR MINERALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2616) to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of a member of our committee better acquainted than I am, I might make this explanation: At the close of the First World War there were many claims on the part of mining men against the Government. An appropriation was made to satisfy those claims. All claims were adjudicated. However, there was

not quite enough money in the appropriation to satisfy all of the claims. There were nine claims that were left unpaid because of lack of funds. These nine claims have been adjudicated, and this measure merely provides for an appropriation to take care of the claims that had been adjudicated and found to be correct. It is a very meritorious bill, and I hope that it will pass.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman mean that this bill appropriates the money to pay these claims?

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, no; the bill authorizes an appropriation.

Mr. CASE. It does not contemplate an appropriation?

Mr. MURDOCK. It is just an authorization.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. When the original bill was pending in the House I tried to defeat it, and I did defeat it for a number of years. Eventually, it was brought in under a rule and, on a roll call, it passed. I said then that it would cost the Government over \$10,000,000. It has. All of the claimants have been paid except the ones named in the bill. It will take about \$50,000 to close the books, and I hope this is the end. These claims never should have been paid in my judgment, but now that everyone has been paid except the few mentioned, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object and I shall not object, but I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and to the House that this is the result of a mistake made by the Congress when it passed what is called the O'Connor rule, to take all of the private bills that were objected to, that had been knocked off the Private Calendar, and then put them into a group and bring them in in what is called an omnibus bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. No, this bill was considered individually under a rule.

Mr. RANKIN. That does not make any difference. Under the operation of the O'Connor rule, after we take a lot of bills costing a large amount of money, off the Consent or Private Calendar, then they put them in an omnibus bill and bring them in here, with vicarious strength in various localities, scattered throughout the country, and put them over, so that so far as saving any money is concerned, it has made the Private Consent Calendar nugatory.

Mr. JENSEN. Who can tell me why all these claims were not allowed at once?

Mr. MURDOCK. These claims were adjudicated over a considerable period of time, but it took time, and the money appropriated that was supposed to cover them, but nine of them were not so covered. All of the others have been paid.

If we do not authorize this appropriation which should be made, those nine

which were and are just as valid as any of the others will stand the total loss.

Mr. JENSEN. But it requires an appropriation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; final settlement depends upon an appropriation. I want to say to the gentleman, I know of none of these nine claims, but I was told by colleagues that there are widows who will inherit some of these claims and one at least who now having waited 25 years, is in need of this money. Now if we do not pass this bill and the money is not appropriated, the nine will suffer a total loss instead of being paid proportionately as the others were paid.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely satisfied with this bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say to the gentleman that all departments of Government concerned have agreed to this and have sanctioned it, even the Bureau of the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JENSEN. I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MENOMINEE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 166, to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when one reads the language of the report by the Committee on Indian Affairs this looks like a very innocent resolution; but as you analyze the resolution and also read the report of the Attorney General, a different picture is presented. The court has rendered a favorable decision in this case and the question is now, how much? The Government and the attorneys for the Indians figure it will be around \$1,500,000. But before they decide the exact amount in comes a resolution and it means, if this passes, the Court of Claims cannot follow the law; that you cannot follow the provisions of the jurisdictional bill; you cannot allow any offset in favor of the Government. We adopted a policy here a number of years ago granting to the Government the power to offset these claims by deducting from the amount the gratuities or advances that have been made to Indians. That same policy should be followed in this case. Pass this resolution and the Government's hands are tied in this respect. They will get the full amount of the judgment and the Government will receive no credit for the gratuities and advances it has made to these Indians.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to call attention to the fact that the Attorney General has approved this resolution with an amendment. Now, the gentleman is not quite correct, I think, in assuming that there are no gratuities which can be chargeable against those Indians. If this bill is passed the gratuities which might accrue against this claim will be transferred to other claims of these same Indians. I contend that we are not changing the policy and doing away with the matter of counting gratuities in computing such claims.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will read the letter from the Attorney General, he will find he approves the claims not with an amendment, but with amendments. And one of the amendments that the Attorney General recommends is the one I recommend, and that is, not to take away from the Government the right of offsetting these claims by deducting the amounts of gratuities and advances we have given to these Indians. Now, if the gentleman wants to follow the recommendations of the Attorney General, all well and good, I will not object to the consideration of the bill. But until that part of the bill is eliminated I will not only object to it, but I will demand a roll call before the bill is disposed of.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I presume the gentleman is familiar with the real purpose of this bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. And in favor of it, with the exception of the part I have objected to here.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. And may I state to the gentleman that the purpose of that bill could not be carried out at all if in the final computation in the amount due the Menominee Tribe as the basis for the interlocutory judgment which has now been rendered the Government was to offset its gratuities against the present claim for the very reason there would not be sufficient money available to enable the Government to purchase the land from the State of Wisconsin which it is proposed to purchase with the proceeds of this judgment. All this bill does in that respect is to simply delay the enforcement of the offset of gratuities as against other claims which are pending and which are valid claims against the Government in behalf of the Menominee Tribe of Indians.

Mr. COCHRAN. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Assuming that the Court of Claims does not render a favorable decision in the other cases pending, then is not the Government out on a limb as far as the gratuities and advances are concerned?

Mr. KEEFE. I would say that if the gentleman's supposition were to be 100 percent correct, perhaps that is true. However, I think anybody who is familiar with the litigation pending be-

tween the Menominee Tribe and the Government will know that the Government is amply protected and that it stands to lose nothing by reason of the declaration to set up offsets in this particular suit. But I would call the attention of the gentleman to this fact: Unless this is done, the opportunity of the Federal Government to acquire these lands for the benefit of the Menominee Tribe, who are wards of the Government, will perhaps be forever lost. We must bear in mind that the acquisition of these lands as part of the timberlands of this tribe is the very thing that has maintained the financial stability of that tribe through their timber operations; and if we do not purchase this land now from the State of Wisconsin, as was originally intended when that reservation was set apart to them, so that this tribe can continue their timber operations, we will have them back on the Government, as wards of the Government, asking for relief in another form. I think we must bear in mind the equities that are involved in this situation in dealing with this problem.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman the financial stability of that tribe of Indians is due to the foresight of Senator La Follette, Sr., who looked after their interests. That is just exactly what other Senators and Representatives did not do in regard to their tribes of Indians. There is no tribe of Indians in the country whose interests have been looked after better than the tribe of Indians involved in this case today.

Mr. KEEFE. In general terms, may I state to the gentleman that I am in agreement with what he says. However, the fact of the matter is that here is an opportunity to carry out the very purpose and policy that has been in vogue all these years through the operation of the Menominee Indian sawmill; and if we do not permit this to go through so that the Government can have sufficient funds out of this judgment to buy this timberland which is a part of the reservation, then we are going to see the plan which Senator La Follette started years ago virtually knocked in the head, and which plan the gentleman this morning is eulogizing. I am interested in it as an economic proposition of justice for this tribe, which tribe, by the way, is not in my district, but with which I am very familiar in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am interested in it from the standpoint of the taxpayers of the United States who have to pay the bill. If you can get from the Attorney General a waiver of his recommendation that he makes in his letter to this committee, the bill can be passed as far as I am concerned. But here is an effort to break down the policy we have been following year after year, since an amendment was added to the deficiency bill by the late Congressman Buchanan, at my request, an opportunity to take away from the Government the right to properly protect itself in these suits. I am not going to be a party to breaking down that policy. Do it for one, and you will be required to do it for others.

Mr. COLE of New York. This resolution contemplates the purchase of certain swamplands from the State of Wisconsin. I understand these identical lands were conveyed by the Federal Government to the State of Wisconsin 75 years ago. I wonder if the gentleman is advised, or any of the other Members interested, as to how much the State of Wisconsin paid to the Federal Government for these same swamplands when they acquired them 75 years ago and for which the State of Wisconsin is now asking \$1,500,000 from the Federal Government.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know anything about what the State of Wisconsin paid for the land, but regardless of what they paid for the land, we should not break down our policy of allowing the Government to charge off money we have already advanced.

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say to the gentleman that I am not familiar with just exactly what took place under the Swampland Act of 1850, but I understand that it involved all of the swamplands in the entire Northwest and operated as a gift by the United States Government to all the States involved in the Northwest purchase which covered these swamplands.

The question as to whether or not the State paid anything for them at that time I do not know; but I may say that every dollar of funds paid by the United States Government for the purchase of these lands goes, under the law, into the school fund of the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. COLE of New York. The State of Wisconsin acquired these lands without any cost. The question that occurs to me now is why they should ask from the Federal Government the price of a million and a half dollars to turn them back to the Federal Government.

Mr. KEEFE. May I state to the gentleman from New York that so far as the State of Wisconsin is concerned it is not asking to sell these lands to the Federal Government; as a matter of fact there is considerable opposition to the sale, because it is felt that the timber on these lands today makes them much more valuable than the price agreement that has been entered into between the Government and the Land Commission of the State of Wisconsin. What we are attempting as an economic proposition is to do for these Indians what the treaty with the United States Government provided, and to keep these Indians self sufficient from an economic basis.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is perfectly true. The Federal Government made a mistake back in 1850. It had made a treaty with the Indians guaranteeing to give them certain territory.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Subsequently under the Swampland Act, it, by mistake, conveyed these same lands to the State of Wisconsin. The thing that disturbs me is why the Government should pay the State of Wisconsin a million and a half dollars solely because of having made a mistake at the time of the original conveyance of the land.

Mr. KEEFE. They are not paying it to the State of Wisconsin, if the gentleman will yield; they are paying it to the Menominee Tribe of Indians as damages to the Indians and the Indians in turn are attempting to use the money to buy this land from the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. That brings me to the proposition that if this money is expended it will not go where it should go or where it should be spent.

Mr. KEEFE. If the money is not used for the purchase of this land the interlocutory judgment, which has been entered, will permit the Government to offset the gratuities of the United States Government against the claim reducing it perhaps by several hundred thousands of dollars. The balance of the money will be paid in cash to the benefit of the Menominee Tribe and will remain to their credit in the funds of that tribe in the Treasury of the United States Government.

Mr. CASE. Then it does not save any money to the United States; it is merely a question of whether or not this money shall be expended from the Treasury for these timber lands or whether it shall be expended to the tribe directly as cash.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly the situation as it exists except when the gentleman from Missouri raises the question of the passage of this resolution it simply delays so far as this particular matter is concerned the off-set of gratuities to enable the Menominee Indians to get sufficient money to buy this land, an agreement having been entered into with land commissioners of the State of Wisconsin as to the purchase price.

Mr. MURDOCK. To any objection that this calls for an expenditure of money, I want to point out that the Indians had better be paid in swampland, to become a part of their sustaining reservation, and the State of Wisconsin paid a sum of money somewhat nearly representing the value of the land in question, which money I understand the State of Wisconsin will put into its public-school fund. I can think of no arrangement which would be better than this nor which will better serve the ends of justice.

Let it be understood that if this transaction is not carried out somewhat according to the terms of this bill, this land containing some valuable timber will be sold to private parties who must cross Indian land to reach it. Thus, besides wrongfully depriving the Indians of something which is rightfully theirs, the way will be paved for innumerable suits and difficulties. On the other hand, if this land is definitely made a part of the Indian reservation, the proceeds from the sale of timber will add to the economic foundation of this tribe of Indians and place them beyond the need of calling for funds out of the Public Treasury as needy wards of the Government. I think that the measure as it stands does not infringe upon or radically change the policy which the gentleman from Missouri has so long upheld.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND CHAPTER 7 OF THE CRIMINAL CODE

The Clerk called the next bill on the calendar, H. R. 3408, to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 7 of the Criminal Code (35 Stat. 1115; U. S. C., title 18, ch. 7) is hereby amended by inserting after section 168 the following new section:

"Sec. 168A. (a) Whoever shall manufacture, sell, offer, or advertise for sale, or shall cause or procure to be manufactured, sold, offered, or advertised for sale, any token, slug, disk, or other device similar in size and shape to any of the lawful coins of the United States, with knowledge or reason to believe that such tokens, slugs, disks, or other devices may be used unlawfully, or fraudulently to procure anything of value, or use or enjoyment of any property or service from any automatic merchandise vending machine, postage-stamp machine, turnstile, fare box, coin-box telephone, parking meter, or other receptacle, depository, or contrivance, designed to receive or to be operated by lawful coins of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$3,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) 'Knowledge or reason to believe,' within the meaning of paragraph (a) of this section, may be shown by proof that any law-enforcement officer has, prior to the commission of the offense with which the defendant is charged, informed the defendant that tokens, slugs, disks, or other devices of the kind manufactured, sold, offered, or advertised for sale by him are being used unlawfully or fraudulently to operate certain specified automatic merchandise vending machines, postage-stamp machines, turnstiles, fare boxes, coin-box telephones, parking meters, or other receptacles, depositories, or contrivances, designed to receive or to be operated by lawful coins of the United States."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when the Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia in 1787, its members were determined that there should be a uniform system of money throughout the Thirteen Colonies and that the integrity of the money to be established must be adequately protected. Hence section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have the power "to coin money" and "regulate the value thereof" and "to provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States."

Pursuant to this authority the Congress has passed several laws designed to prevent counterfeiting, including sections 163, 164, 167, 168, 171, and 178 of the United States Criminal Code. Briefly

and collectively these enactments make it a crime to manufacture, sell, pass, use, or issue any devices in lieu of lawful coins of the United States without lawful authority.

Originally, United States coins were used as money only in hand-to-hand transactions. In the past 50 years, however, along with other progress in manufacturing and distribution, a new use for coins in making possible service to the public through mechanical devices for the sale of numerous items of merchandise and service has been developed to large proportions. Coin telephones, fare-collecting devices, parcel-checking facilities, parking meters, and other service mechanisms as well as vending machines for the sale of sanitary drinking cups, soap, towels, postage stamps, candy, nuts, milk, apples, tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, beverages, and other items, are now in daily use by millions of persons and provide means for serving the public conveniently and economically, without which our present-day economy, especially under current war conditions, would be seriously handicapped.

The use of United States coins in these service and merchandising machines is one of the largest single uses for such coins. It is estimated that well over \$500,000,000 worth of pennies, nickels, and dimes pass through these mechanisms each year. Treasury Department figures indicate a total of approximately \$300,000,000 worth of pennies, nickels, and dimes in the country, including large quantities which repose much of the time in bank vaults and in small private family hoards. This would mean that there is an average of more than one use per year in coin devices for every penny, nickel, and dime in the country.

These devices are, in effect, inanimate tradesmen and render a service that we can ill afford to dispense with. They inform us through printed words the nature and the price of the merchandise they offer for sale; through a glass window they exhibit to us their wares; when we deposit our money, they promptly deliver our purchases; in some cases, they even make change. They expect us to deal as honestly with them as they do with us. Unlike the actual tradesman, however, these inanimate merchants are easily and frequently victimized. The actual tradesman is humane and is possessed of the senses of sight, feeling, and hearing. If a suspiciously spurious coin is proffered him by a customer in exchange for his goods, he employs these senses to determine its authenticity. He looks at its shape and workmanship; he feels to determine its weight, and the nature of its surface; he throws it on the counter and listens for the familiar genuine ring. He not only has the opportunity to make all of these tests but he may also question the customer if he is unsatisfied with the proffered coin. If unconvinced he may demand another coin, and if the same is not forthcoming, he can refuse to deliver the merchandise.

Not so with the inanimate tradesman, however. It was not endowed with the human senses. It cannot see or talk to its customer. It must take the coins

that he deposits and deliver its wares without a protest.

So often were vending machines defrauded through the use of slugs, tokens, and spurious coins that the manufacturers urged their engineers to design some kind of protective equipment. After considerable experimentation, an ingenious contrivance was developed known as a slug rejector. Attached and made a part of the machine, it was designed to endow the device with what might be termed the sense of feeling. By means of mechanical and magnetic tests it would cause the machine to reject tokens or slugs which were slightly larger or smaller in either thickness or diameter than United States coins; it would likewise cause the rejection of coins or slugs with holes in the center or those having serrated edges. As time went on these slug rejectors were further improved to such an extent that they would reject coins or slugs made of brass, iron, lead, aluminum, or other certain metals or combinations of metals.

In spite of these protective steps, the manufacturers of fraudulent slugs were equally alert and equally ingenious. To counteract the effect of the slug rejectors they commenced to fabricate their product out of metals and alloys having properties similar to those of lawful minor coins. In this they have been singularly successful and are marketing on a large scale a product that is capable of circumventing the slug rejectors and operating the vending machines in the same manner as coins of the United States.

They advertise these slugs openly in catalogs, and in cheap newspapers and magazines. The ostensible purpose of their product, they say in their advertisements, is for use in gambling machines. However, they invariably hint of their real purpose by adding such phrases as, "these tokens must not be used in cigarette, candy, telephone, stamp, or legal vending machines." It reminds us of the old prohibition days when certain firms would advertise their product by admonishing their customers not to add sugar and allow it to stand as it would then ferment and become intoxicating.

As a matter of fact, very few gambling machines are equipped with slug rejectors. They are always placed in places where they are continually under the watchful eye of the proprietor or one of his employees. They are usually equipped with a glass window which exhibits the last six or eight coins that have been placed in the mechanism. The operator would be clever, indeed, who could manage to get very many slugs into the average gambling machine without having his movements detected by the watchful eye of the attendant.

The ones who suffer most from this illegal racket are the small vending machine operatives whose business is of such a limited scope that they cannot readily absorb their losses. One such, who managed a cigarette vending machine concern in Cincinnati is a typical example. He said:

Our company took in approximately \$600 worth of slugs during the past year (1940). Inasmuch as our net is one penny on every eight packs sold, we had to sell 480,000 packs to make up our loss.

Several States have enacted statutes aimed at this evil but their effectiveness has been minimized owing to the fact that they have been unable to reach the source of supply. Slugs are usually made and sold in some State where such protective legislation does not exist. Enforcement officers must therefore content themselves by prosecuting solely for their "use." Detections are extremely difficult and convictions few.

The existing Federal laws concerning counterfeiting have proved inadequate. On February 18, 1941, the Federal grand jury at St. Paul, Minn., returned indictments against Nate Gellman, Mike Gellman, W. W. Wilcox Manufacturing Co., and James M. Voorhees, its president, on 14 counts for alleged violations of sections 163, 164, 167, and 168 of the Criminal Code. The Gellmans, operating a novelty store, were charged as principals in the indictment, and the W. W. Wilcox Co. and its president, Mr. Voorhees, with aiding and abetting the Gellmans in the alleged violations. The trial of this case without a jury commenced before Hon. Gunnar H. Nordbye, United States district judge, in December 1941. On April 8, 1942, Judge Nordbye rendered his decision, finding the defendants not guilty—*United States v. Gellman* (44 F. Supp. 360)—and in part of his opinion stated:

The difficulty is that this indictment seeks to charge the defendants with an offense under statutes which were enacted over 100 years ago when vending machines probably did not exist. They were never framed to embrace the use of metal tokens as a substitution for money in the limited sense referred to. While the Court is not unmindful that there should be some curb on the fraud that is being perpetrated by the use of these slugs or tokens, relief must be sought from Congress and not from the courts. The State of Minnesota has recently passed an act which prohibits the manufacture, sale, offering for sale, advertising for sale, or distribution of tokens, checks, or slugs for use in lieu of lawful coins in vending machines, parking meters, service meters, coin boxes, telephone, or other coin receptacles. No doubt Congress would have authority to extend the statutory prohibitions regarding the use of coins or tokens in the manner referred to herein. A criminal statute must be strictly construed, and to apply these statutes to the factual situation disclosed by this evidence would be entirely unwarranted.

The bill under consideration—H. R. 3408—will supplement existing law by making unlawful the manufacture, sale, offer, or advertisement for sale of tokens, slugs, disks, or other devices similar in size or shape to any of the lawful coins of the United States, or causing or procuring any of those things to be done. The offense is made a misdemeanor and the penalty is a fine of not more than \$3,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both. The act must be done with knowledge or reason to believe that such slugs may be used unlawfully or fraudulently in contrivances designed to receive or be operated by lawful coins.

The Departments of the Treasury and Justice, upon whom will devolve the responsibility of enforcement and prosecution if this bill becomes a law have both signified their approval of its enactment.

There can be no logical argument for the manufacture of slugs or trade checks that are of the same size and design of United States coins. If there is a legitimate use for such items, they can be easily made of a size that will take them out from the prohibitions laid down by this bill.

I earnestly urge your affirmative vote for this measure.

AMENDING THE SABOTAGE LAW (WARTIME)

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3442, to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is a minority report on this bill signed by 12 members of the Judiciary Committee. It is obvious that a bill with a minority report is not a proper subject for passage by unanimous consent. I therefore object to its consideration on this calendar.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

FACILITATE AND SIMPLIFY COLLECTION PROCEDURE IN DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 321, to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can somebody explain this bill?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, heretofore in the granting of leases the applicants have had to file with the office of the Comptroller General a duplicate original or certified copies of each lease or permit, certified copies of statement of agreement to perform, and certain other documents.

There are a large number of leases in which the amounts are very small. The actual cost of detail of drawing up and checking through the two offices sometimes amounts to nearly as much as the lease itself involves. The office of the Comptroller General and the Secretary of the Interior took the matter up with each other and there was an amendment agreed upon and recommended by the Comptroller General, which is included in the Senate bill as it passed, providing that this necessity of not having to file certified copies only applies when the amount of the annual rental is \$300 or less. It is just simply to simplify the vast amount of detail work and the vast amount of red-tape expenses, so they limited it to \$300.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That leases, permits, licenses, contracts, agreements, and other instruments providing for payments to the United States on account of the use of lands or waters under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, or on account of the sale of products of such lands or waters, or on account of other transactions incident to the administration of such lands or waters, including contributions by cooperators, but excluding sales of used equipment, shall be exempt from the provisions of section 3743 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (title 41, U. S. C., sec. 20), when the lease or other instruments do not require payment to the Government in excess of \$300 in any 1 fiscal year: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe from time to time regulations requiring that originals or copies of any class or group of documents within the foregoing exemption, in the circumstances and upon the conditions designated by him in such regulations, shall be deposited in the General Accounting Office for audit purposes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SETTLE CERTAIN CLAIMS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 364, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Florida explain this bill?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this particular bill has passed the Senate with amendments to cover certain specific recommendations made. At the present time if there is a surrender of a gas or oil lease, even though you may surrender it on the 10th of January, the legal question has arisen that you may have to pay the rental for the entire year. Under the present construction there is a dispute as to whether or not that construction is correct.

The Congress in 1942 passed an act, which is referred to in the report, for the purpose of working out a compromise. Under the present rule, if you surrender a lease on the 10th of January, in view of the words in one of the other acts referring to annual or yearly rental, they take the position that probably you would have to pay the entire 1943 rental. This bill allows the Secretary of the Interior to settle on a pro rata basis. In other words, if there is reasonable diligence used in surrendering, then, subject to the limitations of the bill, you pay your rental on a pro rata basis when you surrender. If you surrendered in February you would pay only two-twelfths, assuming your lease began January 1.

Mr. JENSEN. This bill only applies to that specific matter?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes. It has the unanimous report of the committee, it has already passed the Senate, and it has been approved also by the Budget, and does not apply to anything

that might be in litigation or sent to the Department of Justice for suit.

Mr. JENSEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say it has the unanimous approval of the Public Lands Committee?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida if it has not become the practice now for the Government, in leasing lands for oil development, to require the rental fee to be paid for 1 year in advance?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I am not sure whether that is required to be paid in advance or not, but it is my understanding that it is required to be paid in advance.

Mr. COLE of New York. And that same practice is customary in the entire oil industry. A private owner having land which he leases for development receives for 1 year in advance the delayed rental fee. I am at a loss to see why the United States as landlord should give to its oil tenants a preferential status by permitting them to pay delayed rentals on a monthly basis over a private owner.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. In 1942 the Congress passed an act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make compromise settlements of claims for accrued rental under a lease issued pursuant to the provisions of the act referred to. It was evidently contemplated in the act where it was stated, "On an accrual basis," that they should base it only on the amount that has been used. In other words, if it is surrendered in February they would pay two-twelfths. But a dispute has arisen as to the meaning of this verbiage, so they have felt that to supplement that particular act it is best to authorize it definitely. It is only in those cases where there is due diligence used. There are many instances in which the Federal Government would like for them to surrender and would like to work them out just as soon as they can and get it worked out.

If you require them to pay the full year in advance, the tendency then is to keep it for the entire year and not surrender except on the last day of the year, because they would be paying the rent anyway. It is to the benefit of the Federal Government to have these leases canceled and out of the way in many instances. There is a dispute, however, as to whether this law actually applies, but it is thought that out of an abundance of caution we should pass this bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does the gentleman mean that where the Government has an oil lease with a private oil company providing for the payment of rental on an annual basis in advance, the Government allows the tenant to remain in possession under that lease for the full year and does not require the terms of the lease to be observed?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No. I mean that unless this particular bill is passed and you do not authorize settlement on a pro rata basis, if a man in July or any month, we may say, determines in his own mind he will surrender,

if he has to pay for the whole year he will not surrender until the end of the year.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course not, because he will have paid the full rental in advance.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. We will assume a particular instance. Along the last of December a man decides to surrender but he does not actually give his notice of surrender until along in February. If he has to pay the full year, if he slipped up a day or two in giving his notice, then he will hold it another year. There are many instances in which the Federal Government is just as anxious to work this out as the operator himself.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does this practice contemplated by the bill conform to the customary standard in connection with the prospecting and development of oil lands in the industry?

Under this bill is the Government giving to its oil tenants any preferred status over an oil tenant who is a private landowner?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I do not know, but I do know that the Department itself, after considering the bill, made its own objections to the bill and they were written into the bill as amendments. The bill was introduced in the Senate and passed the Senate. The gentleman will notice that the latter part of the bill reads as follows:

The authority granted to the Secretary of the Interior by this act shall extend only to cases in which he finds that the failure of the lessee to file a timely surrender of the lease prior to the accrual of the rental was not due to a lack of reasonable diligence, but it shall not extend to claims or cases which have been referred to the Department of Justice for purposes of suit.

In other words, if the Secretary of the Interior finds that there has been a failure to file a timely surrender, then he will not get it on an accrual basis.

Mr. COLE of New York. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept the surrender of any lease issued pursuant to any of the provisions of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 181 and the following), or any amendment thereof, where the surrender is filed in the General Land Office subsequent to the accrual but prior to the payment of the yearly rental due under the lease, upon payment of the accrued rental on a pro rata monthly basis for the portion of the lease year prior to the filing of the surrender. The authority granted to the Secretary of the Interior by this act shall extend only to cases in which he finds that the failure of the lessee to file a timely surrender of the lease prior to the accrual of the rental was not due to a lack of reasonable diligence, but it shall not extend to claims or cases which have been referred to the Department of Justice for purposes of suit.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CROATAN NATIONAL FOREST, N. C.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1315, providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, these lands are located in the same county in which I happen to live. At the time the Croatan National Forest was established certain arrangements were made between the Federal Government and the county governments with reference to moneys to be paid in lieu of taxes. I see no reference to that in this report. In fact, the report is very brief and does not seem to cover the situation very clearly. It seems that this bill came from a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture headed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]. In view of the lack of definite information on this matter, and pending my receiving an explanation from the departments, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, a full report was made to the Senate and also to the House Committee on Agriculture. The Senate bill was not referred to a subcommittee but was considered by the whole committee. The object of the bill is to transfer about 2,500 acres of land which is now in the Croatan National Forest, located in the State of North Carolina, to the Cherry Point aviation base. It involves only the transfer of this acreage from the Department of Agriculture to the Navy Department, with the proviso in the bill that if the Cherry Point base at any time in the future is not used for naval purposes the land reverts to the Croatan National Forest.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman that I have been rather closely connected with the Croatan National Forest from its inception, and also with the marine base, which is established on a part of this land. I understand and recall quite clearly the negotiations between these various departments and the county officials. I cannot quite understand why these gentlemen should keep this to themselves until they bring a bill in here. They are on speaking terms with me and they ought to know, if they do not know, that when they begin to tamper with a national forest which is within 5 miles of my front door I am going to know something about it before it goes through.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. May I say to the gentleman that we did not know that he is interested. This bill came to the Committee on Agriculture in the regular course. The gentleman has never advised the Committee on Agriculture either orally or in writing that he is interested one way or another in the passage of this measure. I did not know until this moment that there was any objection to it. I thought it was only a formal matter.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman that I did not mean to imply that the gentleman knew anything about my interest in it. I do say that both departments affected did know about it, and the officials know about it. The only thing I knew about the bill was when it appeared on the calendar. I certainly could not be expected to read the minds of the departments or the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The gentleman knew that the bill had been introduced. It does seem that he would have gotten in touch with the Committee on Agriculture and advised the committee of his interest in this measure.

Mr. BARDEN. By the same token the committee clerk could have called my office. The bill was introduced in the Senate and came over to the House, according to the Record.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is the way it got to the committee.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not keep up with everything that goes on in the United States Senate. I would be mighty difficult, and I may say the gentleman himself does not know about all the bills that are being considered by all the committees of this House and Senate.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I try to keep up with the bills that affect my district.

Mr. BARDEN. So do I and that is exactly what I am doing now and I do not propose to let this bill pass until I am assured by the proper departments and the county government that all rights of the county are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATING THE PERSON WHO SHALL ACT AS PRESIDENT UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 678, designating the person who shall act as President if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or when neither a President-elect nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is a matter of so great importance that it ought not to be taken up by unanimous consent.

In my humble opinion this bill would probably bring a contest in the House and the Senate in case of a close election that would duplicate the Hayes-Tilden contest of 1876.

This bill provides that wherever there is a contest, unless the President is declared elected by the time for him to be inaugurated at the regular time, the Speaker of the House shall become President provided he has been elected Speaker, and if he has not been elected Speaker, then the President pro tempore of the Senate shall become President.

There are several complications that I see that might grow out of this proposition. Let us take the question of the election of the Speaker. Suppose the House and the Senate get into a row here in 1945, 1949, or 1953 and the same question arises that arose in 1876. In the Tilden-Hayes contest, the question was over the validity of the election returns from the States of Florida and Louisiana. There were two sets of returns from each State, one of them made by the Democrats and the other one made by the Republicans. The question became very bitter. When they came to open the ballots, if the House opened them, if the Speaker presided he was going to open the returns turned in by the Democrats. The Speaker of the House was a Democrat. The President pro tempore of the Senate was a Republican. He claimed precedence over the Speaker of the House, and said that if he opened those ballots, he would open the Republican ballots. Therefore, if the President pro tempore of the Senate presided, Mr. Hayes would be elected, and if the Speaker of the House presided, and opened the other returns, Mr. Tilden would be elected. In order to iron out the situation, an electoral commission was created to settle the question, and on every single ballot every Democrat on the court voted for the Democratic side, and every Republican on the court voted for the Republican side. That was one contest—

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. Suppose both the President-elect and the Vice President-elect should be killed in an accident before taking office. Then there would be a hiatus in the situation which might create a difficult situation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to Republicans being scalawags in those days.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, I said Republicans down there in those States.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman does not expect that situation to arise again, does he?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me finish this picture. Suppose then you have a contest over the election of Speaker, as we did in 1925, at the opening of the Sixty-eighth Congress. Neither the Democrats nor the Republicans had a majority in the House, and there were 13 Independents, and they held the balance of power. They held the House, you might say, in abeyance for 2 weeks. It took 2 weeks to elect the Speaker of the House of the Sixty-eighth Congress. Suppose we had that same situation, and they were to do as a certain fellow did, who was elected to the Senate of a neighboring State once where his own party had just one majority. He said, "If you do not elect me Speaker, I am going to vote with the other side, and they will agree to elect me

Speaker." We might get into that kind of a situation where a few men could control. We might find a candidate for Speaker really running for President via the Speakership route. In that case a majority would elect a Speaker and the big States would control. For instance, New York would have 45 votes and New Mexico 2. But in electing a President directly in the House each State would have 1 vote.

I would much prefer to see you provide either for the Congress to elect the President pro tempore by the regular method or else for the then acting Secretary of State to hold over and act as President until an election is held. I do not believe you will ever get this bill through the Senate. You did not get it through there before, and I am not sure that it would pass the House if it were properly debated under the 5-minute rule.

Let me say to the gentleman from Minnesota that I assure him, in discussing reconstruction days, I know that situation would not arise at this time, but I am speaking of a contest that almost precipitated the Civil War.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And the gentleman recalls that in 1931 we had a very close situation here, because at the time of the election in 1930, or shortly thereafter, there were more Republicans here than there were Democrats, and then on account of deaths the Democrats had a majority and finally elected their Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. That is correct. In the election in 1930, when the election returns were counted, I believe the Republicans had either one or two majority, but because of deaths, one of them being the Speaker, Hon. Nicholas Longworth, or resignations, or contests, by the time the House convened in the next December the Democrats had a majority of five or six. At that time I believe the Independents, the Progressives, voted with the Democrats, to make that majority.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed and appreciate the gentleman's dissertation on this subject. I call his attention to the fact that the passage of some law to take care of this contingency was contemplated in the twentieth amendment as the gentleman well knows. As the matter stands now, we have a very short time between the meeting of Congress on January 3 and the inauguration day on January 20.

Mr. RANKIN. And let me say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in that connection that the passage of the twentieth amendment and its after-effect, ought to be a warning to the American people in the future not to hastily change the Constitution of the United States. They went out here and paraded the fact that there were "lame ducks" in Congress, men who were holding office after they had been defeated, and so they killed all of the "lame duck" Congressmen, and created a "lame duck" President for 17 days. So, instead of straightening the Constitution out, they complicated it more, and today we have this situation in which the gentleman from Tennessee is trying to forestall a

probable contingency, that may not arise for perhaps 10 or 15 or 20 years; and what I am afraid of is that his remedy will be worse than the disease.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the gentleman that I have thought about this a good deal and the late Mr. William Tyler Page, gave it a great deal of study in his keen intellectual way. I do not visualize any situation that may arise where this procedure would get us into a log jam or into a difficulty. In the first place, if the President-elect and the Vice President-elect should die or for some reason be unable to qualify, the natural person to become President until one has been elected would be the Speaker of the House, because there has been an election and the House is close to the people, closer, I think, than the Senate. May I also call the gentleman's attention to the fact, until the succession statute was passed, around 1886, the succession went to the President pro tempore of the Senate and then to the Speaker of the House. I believe this was provided for by the Congress of 1795. In the act of 1886 this was changed and the succession passed to the Secretary of State and on down through the Cabinet. These acts are effective only after a President shall have qualified. The other contingency where we might find ourselves without a President on Inauguration Day is if the electoral college fails to elect a President and none has been elected by January 20, the Speaker of the House and then the President pro tempore of the Senate are by this bill designated to act. But if there is a dispute in the House and the House cannot elect a Speaker, then naturally it will go to the President pro tempore of the Senate. But I do not think there would be a log jam, because of this. In the event the House is called upon to elect a President and the duty automatically devolves upon the Senate to elect a Vice President, if the Senate elects a Vice President before January 20 and the House has not elected a President, the Vice President will be inaugurated and will serve until the President is elected. If by January 20 the House has not elected a Speaker (it could not elect a President until it is organized) and the Senate has not elected a Vice President, then in that event, the President pro tempore of the Senate would, under this bill, act as President. Under our procedure and Constitution I can imagine no situation or condition that may arise where this bill would not assure us of having a President on Inauguration Day. Without this legislation there are two contingencies which are not taken care of. This should and must be remedied. They are remote but they may occur. This almost happened three times in our history. The twentieth amendment adds to the possibility. I think this is the best procedure we can work out. Certainly some system is needed to take care of this contingency, because we would be in a dilemma if we should reach January 20 of an inauguration year without a President having qualified. Then, if we tried to pass a law to name the one who should act as President, there would be no President to sign the act. I do

not know what kind of chaos or what kind of situation might result.

Mr. RANKIN. Congress would have a right to elect a President pro tempore to take the place of the President in case there was no one qualified to occupy that office.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Suppose Congress has not, by January 20, elected a President?

Mr. RANKIN. You can elect a President to take the place of the President or fill the place until the President is declared elected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But Congress and the House may not have been able to organize by the 20th of January.

Mr. RANKIN. Then you would have no Speaker. I am afraid you are creating confusion in the House and conflict with the Senate in advance if you ever get this bill through, which I do not believe you will.

Take the Andrew Johnson contest, which took place before what the gentleman calls the Act of Presidential Succession, which was passed, I believe, in 1886, or somewhere in the early 1880's. Up to that time there was no provision for the members of the Cabinet to succeed to the Presidency, and under that act it was provided that in case of a vacancy in the Presidency and the Vice Presidency, the Secretary of State should succeed to the Presidency, then the Secretary of the Treasury, then the Secretary of War, and then the Attorney General and then the Postmaster General and then the Secretary of the Navy, then the Secretary of the Interior. That is as far as the rule of Presidential succession goes, because the other Cabinet positions were created after the passage of that act. As I pointed out some time ago, the key word to this succession is St. Wapni.

But let me go back to the Andrew Johnson contest. In that impeachment, if Andrew Johnson had been convicted by the Senate, he would have gone out of office. There was no one eligible to succeed him without an election by the Congress. But the Congress was prepared to elect a President in case there had been a two-thirds vote for sustaining the impeachment of Andrew Johnson.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. And by the way, right at that point, we still have the right, in case of a vacancy, the Congress has the right to elect the President. What I am afraid of here is that you are going to stimulate confusion in advance of this contingency and probably start a row in Congress and maybe a row between the two Houses if this bill is ever passed at all.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There was an act passed prior to 1886, I think the act was passed in 1795, which provided for the succession of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate pro tempore, I do not recall which came first.

Mr. RANKIN. I can tell the gentleman which was going to come first, it was the President pro tempore of the Senate. He was the man slated to take Andrew Johnson's place as President of the

United States if Andrew Johnson had been convicted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The reason I think it would not be a good idea for the Secretary of State to hold over an act as President is that his administration might be going out of power and his administration would not have had the approval of the people. Also the Secretaries are not elected officials. So the order we have provided here, I think, would more closely represent their will on the matter.

Mr. RANKIN. Very well. Now, let me show you another double play the gentleman is likely to hit into. This bill goes to the Senate. I know what the Senate will do. They will turn it upside down and provide for the President pro tempore of the Senate to succeed to the Presidency in advance of the Speaker, or anyone else. Suppose the President pro tempore of the Senate is sick or disqualified, then you will have to go through the formality of ousting him and electing another one, or else you will still have a vacancy in the Presidency. It seems to me we are going a little too fast in the passage of legislation of this kind, and that it is likely to result in confusion in the House sooner or later, and in a conflict with the Senate. I do not feel like taking the responsibility of objecting to this bill if other Members want it passed, but I just wanted to warn you what you are getting into.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In view of the interesting debate we have listened to regarding this bill, it is sufficient evidence to convince anyone that a measure of this importance should not be considered on the Consent Calendar and, therefore, I object.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes; I will withhold it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to object anyway. I demand the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I still believe it is of sufficient importance to have the debate again, and I object.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

INCREASE IN RATES OF COMPENSATION TO DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, House Resolution 339 (Rept. No. 863), on the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability, and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-

incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3236) to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the committee to explain the purpose of this bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] is correct in asking that there be an explanation of the measure. He is a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and that committee has unanimously reported this measure. I would like to go back and say that in the Seventy-seventh Congress legislation of this type was passed by the Congress. It was reported favorably by the Committee on the District of Columbia in the Senate, but shortness of time precluded consideration of the matter in that body.

We have at the present time the so-called Home Care Act for dependent children. That act, for the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia, was passed and became law June 22, 1926. A careful study of the provisions of that legislation, as enacted, has indicated to the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia and to the Social Security Board of the Federal Government that it is inadequate to meet the needs of the Federal Government from the standpoint of certain standards which have been set up, under which disbursements of money are made.

Many of the States, in view of the Social Security Board's recommendations, have brought into line their own statutes, to comply with the recommendations. We have in the District of Columbia appropriate legislation which has gone into effect, for old-age assistance and aid to the blind, but in connection with aid to dependent children it is felt that the present act is cumbersome and does not easily fit itself into the pattern of what is being done through the Social Security Board. Under the legislation which is proposed we would set up one over-all method to deal with this subject within the Board of Public Welfare. At the present time there are two methods, and

it has been found there have been jurisdictional disputes and failure to care for the children in the time limit, which should be required to give that assistance. It is also necessary to set up legislation in a way that we may be eligible for the matching of Federal funds which will aid us in the District of Columbia.

Also, it would permit the inclusion among those eligible to receive a grant of an incapacitated father who lives with his family; also, it would determine eligibility for aid on the basis of residence of the child instead of residence of the parents. It would provide assistance to children of 16 and 17 years of age.

It is believed that it is simply an expeditious way of handling a problem which has become cumbersome because of the inadequacies existing in the District of Columbia since it became law in 1926.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. What appropriations would this bill require eventually? Would it increase the appropriation in the Public Health item in any way?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; it would not. The funds coming in would simply clear through the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEFAN. So it will not require an additional appropriation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No.

Mr. STEFAN. It simply provides a reorganization and simplification of the program of relief generally; is that the idea?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; the gentleman is correct in saying that it improves the manner in which we are now operating the dependent-child-aid program in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand there are some approximately 900 to 1,000 people on direct relief in the District of Columbia. Does the gentleman understand that also?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am not sure of the figure. I do know, however, there are a considerable number of people receiving direct relief.

Mr. STEFAN. They are numbered among the unemployables in the District of Columbia. Would they be benefitted by this act in any way?

Mr. RANDOLPH. We believe that legislation previously passed and which has been the law of the District of Columbia sets up the machinery by which we are very easily accommodating ourselves locally to the Federal act in connection with the distribution of funds to the aged and to the blind.

Mr. STEFAN. But the bill under consideration does not call for any additional appropriations?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; the bill deals strictly with the matter of aid to dependent children.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the distinguished chairman of the committee has adequately expressed the opinion of the committee on this meas-

ure. There is no controversy about it and I understand it was reported out unanimously.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct. He, together with other minority Members, gave consideration to this subject as did the Members of the majority.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the care and assistance of dependent children is hereby declared to be a special matter of public concern and a necessity in promoting the public health and welfare. To provide such care and assistance at public expense, a system of aid to dependent children is hereby established for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The terms "aid" and "assistance" wherever used in this act shall be construed to mean money payments with respect to a dependent child or dependent children. As used in this act, the term "dependent child" shall be construed to mean a child under the age of 18 who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent, and who is living with his father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, brother, sister, stepfather, stepmother, stepbrother, stepsister, uncle, or aunt in a place of residence maintained by one or more of such relatives as his or their own home.

SEC. 3. Aid to dependent children shall be granted with respect to a child who has resided in the District of Columbia for 1 year immediately preceding the application, or who was born in the District of Columbia within 1 year immediately preceding the application, one or both of whose parents has resided in the District of Columbia for 1 year immediately preceding the birth.

SEC. 4. The Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia shall administer assistance under this act. It shall prescribe the form and print and supply the blanks for applications, reports, and affidavits, and such other forms as it may deem advisable, and shall make rules and regulations necessary for the carrying out of the provisions of this act and shall make and render any and all reports required by the Social Security Board of the United States Government or otherwise authorized or required by law, and comply with such provisions as the Social Security Board of the United States Government may, from time to time, find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

SEC. 5. The amount of assistance for any child and the manner of providing it shall be determined by the Board of Public Welfare with due regard to the conditions existing in each case, and shall be sufficient when added to all other income and support available to the child, to provide such child with a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health.

SEC. 6. Application for assistance under this act shall be made to the Board of Public Welfare. The application shall be made in the manner and form prescribed by the Board of Public Welfare, and shall contain information as to the age and residence of the child and such other information as may be required by the Board of Public Welfare.

SEC. 7. Upon the receipt of an application for assistance, an investigation and record shall be made of the circumstances in order to determine the dependency of the child and to ascertain the facts supporting the appli-

cation and such other information as may be required by the Board of Public Welfare.

SEC. 8. Upon completion of such investigation the Board of Public Welfare shall decide whether the child is eligible for assistance under the provisions of this act, and shall determine the amount of such assistance and the date on which assistance shall begin.

SEC. 9. All assistance grants made under this act shall be reconsidered by the Board of Public Welfare as frequently as it may deem necessary. After such further investigations as the Board of Public Welfare may deem necessary, the amount of assistance may be changed, or assistance may be entirely withdrawn if the Board of Public Welfare finds that the child's circumstances have altered sufficiently to warrant such action.

SEC. 10. If an application is not acted upon within a reasonable time of the filing of the application, or is denied in whole or in part, or if any award of assistance is modified or canceled under any provision of this act, the applicant or recipient may appeal for a hearing to the Board of Public Welfare in a manner and form prescribed by the Board.

SEC. 11. All assistance granted under this act shall be deemed to be granted and to be held subject to the provisions of any amending or repealing act that may hereafter be passed, and no person shall have any claim for compensation or otherwise, by reason of a child's assistance being affected in any way by any amending or repealing act.

SEC. 12. The Board of Public Welfare is hereby authorized and directed to cooperate in all necessary respects with the Social Security Board of the United States Government in the administration of this act, and to accept any sums allotted or appropriated by such Board, as are available under the provisions of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 13. Congress shall appropriate annually and make available to the order of the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia such sums as may be needed to pay the share of the District of Columbia for aid to dependent children provided under this act together with a sufficient sum to defray its share of administrative expenses to be incurred in connection therewith, and include such sums in the annual District of Columbia Appropriation Act. Should the sum so appropriated, however, be expended or exhausted during the year for the purposes for which it was appropriated, additional sums shall be appropriated by Congress, as the case demands, to carry out provisions of this act. The balance remaining in the appropriation "Home care for dependent children" as contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 1, 1943 (Public Law 107, 78th Cong., 1st sess.), as of the effective date of this act is hereby made available to carry out the provisions of this act and shall continue available for such purpose through June 30, 1944.

SEC. 14. All necessary expenses incurred by the District of Columbia in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be paid in the same manner as other expenses of the District of Columbia are paid.

SEC. 15. Any adult person who attempts to obtain, or obtains, or aids or assists any child or other person to obtain, by false representation, fraud, or deceit, any allowance under this act, or who receives for the benefit of any child any allowance knowing it to have been fraudulently obtained, shall upon conviction in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, criminal division, be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 16. This act shall be cited as the "Aid to Dependent Children Act."

SEC. 17. The act entitled "An act to provide home care for dependent children in the

District of Columbia," approved June 22, 1926, and all other provisions of law in conflict with this act, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 18. If any provisions of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ACT PROVIDING FOR THE PAYMENT OF ALLOWANCE ON DEATH OF OFFICER OR ENLISTED MAN TO WIDOW

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers may be read in lieu of the conference report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the act entitled 'An act to provide for the payment of 6 months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct' (41 Stat. 367), approved December 17, 1919, as amended and supplemented (42 Stat. 1385; 45 Stat. 249; 55 Stat. 796; 10 U. S. C. 903, 903a), be, and the same is hereby further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'And, *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of any beneficiary before payment to and collection by such beneficiary of the amount authorized herein, such gratuity shall be paid to the next living beneficiary in the order of succession above stated: *And, Provided further*, That if there be no widow, child, or previously designated dependent

relative, the Secretary of War shall cause the amount herein provided to be paid to any grandchild, parent, brother or sister, or grandparent shown to have been dependent upon such officer or enlisted man prior to his death, and the determination of such fact by the Secretary of War shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government: *And, Provided further*, That the last foregoing proviso shall be effective as of August 27, 1940."

"Sec. 2. Nothing herein shall be construed to invalidate or in any manner affect any payments made prior to the date of the approval of this act, but no gratuity payment shall hereafter be made to the representative of the estate of a beneficiary who died prior to such approval."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,

Managers on the part of the House.

R. R. REYNOLDS,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment and that the Senate agree to the same.

There are only two changes in the conference report from the Senate amendment. One of these is merely clarifying and consists of striking out the words "of section 903" which is a reference to the U. S. Code and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thereof." Reference to the statutory citations had already been sufficiently made.

The other change is material and provides for the act to have retroactive effect to August 27, 1940. The effect of the Senate amendment is to include certain persons as beneficiaries entitled to the death gratuity benefit who were not included under the original act. The committee of conference was of the opinion that such inclusion was proper but that if made it should have retroactive effect to the date from which the original act was effective, to wit, August 27, 1940, that being the date upon which dependents of persons in the military service other than the regular Army first became entitled to the death gratuity.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I think for the benefit of the members of the committee the gentleman from Alabama should give a brief explanation of the conference report. This is a very simple bill extending the right of beneficiaries. There is no Member of the House better qualified on this and allied

subjects than the gentleman from Alabama. I wish he would make an explanation of the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] I may say that when the Senate took up this subject matter, the bill had already passed the House. The original bill was introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] who is on the floor. In the Senate the bill was redrawn so as to include additional beneficiaries.

The conference committee felt it was proper to include in the additional beneficiaries a retroactive provision to take care of the case of beneficiaries of men who had died prior to the enactment of this act and subsequent to August 27, 1940, that being the effective date of the act originally extending these benefits to dependents of those persons in the military service other than in the Regular Army. That was about the only change that was made by the conference committee.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include therein a statement released to the press as of yesterday by the National Stripper Oil Well Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been watching the situation and trying to do everything in my power to secure some aid in the way of an increased price in crude oil for the benefit of the independent oil operators and the stripper oil-well owners, and unless the Congress takes a hand either by legislation or resolution to see that an increase in the price of crude oil is granted, it is going to be a severe blow and shock to both the stripper well owners and the independent operators. It is for that reason that I have signed the discharge petition of the Disney bill, because I personally know that unless some aid is given to the independent operators, they are soon to go out of business.

The independent oil operator has rendered a great service to the oil industry and to this Nation. They have been the trail blazers, the pathfinders, and the frontiersmen in the discovery of oil. Now, with the high cost of living, the high cost of labor and material, and placing the oil business under the Labor Act, it is going to be impossible for them to continue in business unless an increase in price is granted.

They are not the ones who have received the Government contracts for the

manufacture of gas and oils used in our war effort. The major oil companies have a monopoly on these contracts, and the only market for the independent oil companies is the open market, and when the cost of production amounts to more than the market price of the commodity, it is easily seen that this part of the industry will soon fade out of the picture.

A very distinguished citizen of my district, Mr. J. D. Sandefer, Jr., who is president of the Stripper Well Association, has released to the press yesterday morning a statement which shows the necessity for aid to this part of the oil industry, and I am happy to include that statement in my remarks:

It is encouraging to me and to the many other operators of the small oil wells of the Nation that there is a rapidly growing interest on the part of Congressmen in the maintenance of the small, or stripper wells. These wells, 300,000 in number, today produce about 15 percent of the national daily supply of crude oil.

Now, that the shortage of oil is an acknowledged fact, there is greater reason than ever before for making the most of the stripper-well reserves. That can be done only by increasing the price of crude oil.

The administration still has the responsibility of granting such increase. It has refused to grant the increase. Our present appeal is to Congress. In my discussions during this visit to Washington, I find a sympathetic attitude on the part of Congressmen from both the oil-producing and the non-oil-producing States. All have an interest in providing a greater supply for the military program and for essential civilian and industrial uses.

In most of the public utterances on the question of oil supply, great emphasis has heretofore been placed on the need for finding new oil fields. That, of course, is of great importance. It should be remembered, though, that we have a great reserve, already marked out and available, in the form of the stripper wells—approximately three-fourths of all the oil wells in the United States.

There are two alternatives. Under a policy of continuing the present prices, the production of oil from the stripper wells will decline. Already many thousands of them have been abandoned for all time and more are being abandoned every day. The other alternative is to increase the price and make greater use of these small wells. With some margin above day-to-day expenses the operator can apply methods that will increase production.

The choice is that simple. We can add to this 15 percent of national production from stripper wells, or, with no change in price, we can stand by and watch the supply continue to decline and lose valuable reserves forever.

Those responsible for price policy have thought only of the cream—the production from new wells. They ignore the high-cost milk—the stripper-well supply. It is of considerable importance also that the stripper-well portion of the industry represents upward of a fourth of our total proved reserves and affords employment to more than 50,000 persons, with an annual pay roll of \$100,000,000.

As a new member of the Petroleum Industry War Council, I attended my first meeting of that group in Chicago November 8 and 9. It is of encouragement to the stripper operators that the council, composed of majors and independents, urged congressional action on oil prices.

The attempt to obtain a correction of price inequity and injustice has been going on for many months. Everyone, seemingly, is con-

vinced of the necessity—except the few to whom Congress has delegated authority to take affirmative action. Since that authority came from Congress, it is to Congress that our appeal is now being made. The thousands of stripper-well operators feel a strong sympathy for the millions of consumers of petroleum products. They both suffer from the same cause. One needs the product, the other has the products and is asking for the chance to supply them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an address by Leonard E. Read, given on October 25, at Pittsburgh, Pa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, there was submitted to the Public Printer an address entitled "Reasons for Rationing" and he estimates it will require one and one-third pages at an additional cost of \$60. I ask unanimous consent to include this as part of an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notwithstanding the additional expense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests, first, that I may revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and second, that I may insert in the Appendix of the RECORD in an extension of my own remarks three editorials from the Santa Ana Register, the Pacific Rural Post, and the Denver Post. I made this same request last Monday but due to confusion they were not included at that time, and I preferred to have them wait until today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to review somewhat briefly the arguments against the present subsidy program as it is proposed to impose that program upon the producers and the consumers of the United States and as it will be discussed in this chamber the last few days of this week when the Commodity Credit Corporation bill is before us for action.

It has been my contention in the several preceding talks that the subsidy program as now proposed is not wanted by thoughtful producers nor thoughtful processors nor thoughtful consumers. It has been my contention that historically it has been a failure, and that its application today is essentially political.

I gather, if I may say so jokingly, that those who support the present idea of a subsidy are the farmers from Chicago, the farmers from New York City, and the farmers from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. No farmer who lives upon the farm and no consumers who are concerned with the results of such a subsidy program have appeared directly or indirectly in this Hall in support of the present plan of imposing a consumer subsidy upon them, for which the consumer is then to be taxed.

Among the things said to those of us who are trying to set down the practical results of such a program is, "Oh, you simply do not like control." Whether we like control or not has nothing to do with the argument. There has been no statement on this floor, from any who have spoken as I speak, that we should remove the control program. What we want to do is to inject certain features into that program which would put it upon a basis of production, which would inject into it good management, which would return the confidence of the people, and which would, and the only thing which will, prevent inflation.

I regret to see that the gentleman from Texas is not here. One of the most peculiar aspects of the situation to me is the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is now supporting this subsidy program. I am one of the men who in 1936 went out and battled under the gentleman's banner on behalf of the small merchants. I still carry the scars of that battle; yet today we find the gentleman from Texas lined up with a program which would drive the small merchant, the small retailer, the small farmer, and the small producer out of business.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am somewhat surprised to hear the remarks the gentleman has made in regard to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], because, as I understand it, the gentleman from Texas is supposed to be chairman of a committee to aid small businessmen, retail and wholesale, and manufacturers, so that they can stay in business.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct. On the floor of this House on October 15 the gentleman from Texas made an appeal on behalf of small business. I think that is the time he pointed out that there were 10,000 annual failures among small business in the United States.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that when the Retail Merchants' Association met not long ago in the city of New York it adopted a strong resolution against consumers' food subsidies?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for that valuable contribution. We have right here in Washington today the most significant evidence of what I am saying. This is the Nagel case, which is now being tried before the emergency

court set up to try protests against O. P. A. regulations. The Nagel case will be significant when history looks back upon this very confusing period.

That case involves the appeal of a small packer, not Swift & Co., which has a representative in the O. P. A., not the Kroger Co., which has a representative in the O. P. A., not of a chain store, nor of big business. This is an appeal of one small packer against regulations which he contends are going to put him out of business. I think it is a very significant thing because the men who wrote these regulations in O. P. A. are not representatives of the small merchants, nor of the farmer, nor of the consumer. We find the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in strange company.

I do not want inflation. The argument is on the prevention of inflation. Those of us who come from rural areas; those of us who had experience with conditions at the time of the last war; those of us who are genuinely in sympathy with producers, and small merchants, and consumers, say that the program will not prevent inflation. One thing that will prevent inflation is production, production, production, and more production. The second thing is good management. The third thing is the restoration of confidence. The fourth thing is a recognition and acceptance of the established marketing methods of the United States.

Well, says the O. P. A., prices to consumers will rise; we must hold the line. Let us see about that. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] made a very eloquent speech upon this floor in which he pointed out that without subsidies, and following the established marketing procedures of generations in the meat industry, the price of meat need not rise to the consumer, while at the same time the producer would receive enough to cover the cost of production.

I have in my hand a cut from a newspaper. It is of a butcher showing hams which he is required to sell at a price less than the cost at which he can buy them, so he has no hams for sale. I do not see how that helps the consumer.

I myself showed sometime ago—and will extend my remarks in the RECORD to include item by item the designated O. P. A. regulation by number, and by designation—that the price of Idaho potatoes under the regulatory methods of the O. P. A. was 7.3 cents a pound to the consumer, and had the ordinary processes of marketing been followed the price to the consumer would have been 5.5 cents a pound. I am unable to see how that helped the consumer.

The step-by-step regulations of the O. P. A. were—

The ceiling price to the farmer for April 1943, U. S. No. 1 Idaho Russet Burbank potatoes, in 100-pound sacks, f. o. b. Idaho, was \$2.30 (O. P. A.—M. P. R., April 8, 1943, 1351.1017, amendment 9).

This includes an allowance of 25 cents for grading labor, and sacking. The empty sack costs the farmer 15 cents.

To this 10 cents may be added for quality labeling, "U. S. No. 1 Extra" (1351.1017-a No. 1) making \$2.40.

Ten cents may be added for size; 2-inch minimum potatoes (1351.1017-b No. 2), \$2.50.

An allowance for risk in transit of 10 cents makes it \$2.60 (M. P. R. 271-1351.1002-e December 21, 1942).

Freight, Idaho to New York, is \$1.10 plus 3 percent tax, making it \$3.73.

The cost to the service wholesaler, that is, the cost on delivery in New York, is therefore \$3.73, and this wholesaler may add 21 percent including delivery charges. If he sells cash and carry he may add 9½ percent. The usual addition is 21 percent, making the price \$4.51.

The second wholesaler—or jobber—who sells to the retail trade, may also add 21 percent, making the price \$5.46. (November 7, 1942, M. P. R. 271, 1351.1003-3, class 3-5).

The retailer may mark up the potatoes, for sale to the consumer, on a varying scale, worked out on a basis of the gross business he does. The average is 33 percent. This makes the price of the 100-pound sack of potatoes to the consumer \$7.28. Since they're sold in smaller quantities, let's say simply that the farmer got 2.2 cents a pound, and the consumer paid 7.3 cents a pound.

Now, let's see how it could be done. I have before me a letter from a well-known jobber in New York City. He sets up a comparable schedule, taking the present price to the farmer of \$2.30 as a base and figuring the additions as they were figured prior to O. P. A. He says the wholesalers and jobbers would be very willing to sell on this basis.

Price to farmer, \$2.30; add freight plus 3 percent, \$3.43; add 10 cents for risk, as above, \$3.58; wholesaler adds 15 cents, \$3.68; jobber adds 15 cents, \$3.83; allow the retailer an average mark-up of 33 percent, \$5.10.

He has not allowed the quantity and size additions, which we should do in making a fair comparison between the price schedules. For these add 20 cents. Also the jobber's 15 cents does not include the cartage. Perhaps an average of 20 cents would cover that. I am guessing on this average cost, but I make a fair comparable total of \$5.50.

The farmer would get his 2.3 cents per pound, as before, but the consumer would pay 5½ cents instead of 7.3 cents.

The O. P. A., established to keep down prices, has in the case shown here raised the price approximately 2 cents a pound to the housewife.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to throw this in at this point. I am informed by members of the trade here in the city that the most reputable produce dealers in this town, some of whom sell goods directly to the White House, are today invoicing the goods at ceiling prices and in addition collecting from the purchaser, the retail groceryman or the consumer, for instance like the White House, an extra amount of money to take care of the additional costs which these people are paying to get the goods to their produce establishments. I think everybody from the White House down, in this city, who is in close contact with the trade knows that the type of operation is being carried on in a big way, with everybody thoroughly understanding it and nobody in the trade kicking about it, and with the consumer taking the rap.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman because that is my idea exactly. The gentleman should have continued and called attention to the situation in sugar in which, thanks to the general food program, we shall have even less sugar

production in the United States this year than we had last year which was less than half of the year before.

Place yourself, Mr. Speaker, in the position of a housewife who has been told by the O. P. A. that she should can all the fruit and all the vegetables and everything she can in order to offset the presumed shortage of foodstuffs this winter. She then is told she can have no sugar with which to can them. What do you expect her to think? She knows her fruit and her preserves will spoil. She thinks, and you cannot blame her, that if this is the order of the Food Administration, and she knows there is plenty of sugar, then somebody must want her to buy manufactured jams and fruits, that is, producers' products. She knows something is wrong somewhere. She will put the blame on the first available scapegoat. She has heard, just as you and I have heard, that the O. P. A. is full of young men who know nothing about farms, nor about production. They came to the O. P. A. from canners, packers, and processors, from chain stores, and from classrooms. They are not farmers. They do not know anything of the practical methods of marketing established for more than 50 years by the trial-and-error method. That method may not appeal to a college professor, but it certainly has someplace in the program of food administration.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. May I point out that the people back home are readily realizing that all this pious talk from the O. P. A. about holding down prices is purely a fraud and a deception. They use that as a guide to disrupt the industry.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I will prove to the gentleman why that is so, if he will let me interrupt him at that point, because here is citrus, with which I am personally familiar. The citrus industry for a period of several months has been working on a plan with the War Food Administration, which agency Congress authorized to make such decisions. The plan involves two things, that the producer shall receive 30 cents a box more than he is presently getting and that the consumer shall pay \$2 a box less than the supposed prices, or perhaps \$4 or \$5 less than the actual prices on the market. The O. P. A. would not accept that plan but insists on imposing subsidies upon the citrus industry, which the citrus industry does not want and did not ask for, and which completely upsets the established methods of exactly 50 years of marketing citrus fruits.

The curious thing is this. In the explanation of the O. P. A. as to why this plan is to be imposed upon the industry, I find this very curious paragraph. I shall not quote it, but the gist of it is that this will save the consumer \$40,000,000 as compared to the price the consumer paid last year. I inquired as to how that could be. I was told that the reason is that \$40,000,000 more was charged last year between the producer

and the consumer than apparently should have been charged.

I lay that before you, Mr. Speaker, because that is exactly what we have said, that under this plan of subsidies and this plan of food administration, we are giving the handler more than he received in normal times and much more than he expects in wartime.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement. He is an able and distinguished member of the House Committee on Agriculture, to which I likewise belong. The gentleman has just discussed part of the matter to which I desire to call his attention. He has explained the obduracy of the O. P. A. toward accepting not only a plan which will accomplish the original objective for which the O. P. A. was created, to wit, holding the cost of living down to the consumer, but a plan which was submitted and discussed not only with the O. P. A. by the Office of Food Administration but with the producers and the distributors, in short, the entire citrus industry. The gentleman recalls that that statement was clearly made in the hearings.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Very well.

Mr. KLEBERG. The plan to which the gentleman is referring, which the O. P. A. has sent over and requested a directive on, is one which has not been discussed in any of its minutia or detail with any of the branches of production or distribution or the general constitution of the citrus industry.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KLEBERG. The point I am trying to make is that after the disruption of what has been evolved through more than 50 years, yes, through 150 years, in the minds of producers and distributors in this country under the general system of doing business, we are now asked in the midst of the greatest war in history to set that aside and try a plan, a résumé of which the gentleman and I finally got after our best efforts and on which we hoped to give the industry at least some advice. I have a telegram I can give the gentleman which he should place in his statement and have made a part of the Record.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman, and I know that same situation applies to meat. I skip over various articles, celery, melons, vegetables, and the price of pork chops, which was mentioned in my hearing the other day, the price of feed to the farmer, in which the regulations help neither producer nor consumer, as was brought out by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] recently.

I come now to the price of apples and, thanks to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES], I am able to give you a visual demonstration of the workings of the O. P. A. I hold in my hand two apples from the State of Washington, one very large, the other very small. Both are exactly the same kind of apple,

the same species. They are "Delicious," both in name and in taste. Under the regulations of the O. P. A., both of these apples must sell on the market at the same price by the retailer. Will anyone tell me just how that helps the consumer?

I use that visual demonstration, not particularly to advertise the apples of the State of Washington, though I am very glad to do that, but I do it because exactly the same thing is being applied to the citrus industry, but our oranges are not yet ready for the market, so that I am not able to show you examples of those.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, I yield gladly.

Mr. HILL. I notice the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] has left the room, but I call the attention of the House to the fact that that same plan is maintained in the price of beef. Men who have specialized in the production of the finest beef in America find themselves squarely up against the O. P. A. regulations, so that very ordinary and common beef will sell for just as high a price as the best.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And does the gentleman from Colorado think that that helps the consumer?

Mr. HILL. It does not help anyone, and puts your market in a chaotic condition until all our feeders that are feeding good beef—we hope it will be good—do not know what they are going to get, or how.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman's statement about Washington apples. I might emphasize this, that in the selling of those two apples for the same price, we in turn have been told, as Members of Congress, that it is the outstanding function of the O. P. A., even sanctimoniously, to protect the consumer.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have very limited time left, and I am going to try and start upon a discussion which is the result of a question asked me the other day by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

The gentleman from Pennsylvania asked me if it were not so that the subsidy program as we apply it here had been applied in England and in Canada, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] subsequently made the statement that it had so been applied in Germany. I am very glad that they were the ones who brought the question up, and not myself. Certain conditions are involved which are very important. First of all, England is an importing and not a producing country. Second Germany went through very much the same sort of thing that we have been going through until the actual war broke out; then Germany applied a sort of freeze to the entire price structure, wages, handling costs, processing costs, packing costs, retailing costs, down to the consumer. I do not know what the situation

is today in Germany. It is probably badly out of balance at the moment, thanks to the operations of the Allied air forces, but that at least was the intention, and changes in the consumer's price were made only after careful analysis of all of the elements involved. If a raise in wages was allowed to an industry, that increase in wages could, if necessary, appear in the consumer's price, but only to the actual extent it reflected itself in the consumer price. Much of it was absorbed in the handling process, and we would have been much better off to adopt that plan, but I have shown you that even today we could still increase the producer's price, without necessarily raising the consumer's price.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have heard so many fine speeches on this subject. What are we going to do about it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Two things are to be done. The question of the gentleman from Massachusetts is good. I said the last time this is not a subject which required a complicated answer because it is a complicated question. It can be cured by a simple answer. First of all, we must quickly and obviously remove the constant interference, the constant confusion and conflict, and that would be done by the passage of the bill (H. R. 2837) introduced and now being held in the Rules Committee, the bill of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], chairman of the Agricultural Committee, which would establish responsibility for a unified program under one head as we had in the last war and as we should have started off with immediately in this war.

Mr. GIFFORD. Who would appoint that man?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The bill calls for the Secretary of Agriculture to hold that position because he is an official of the Government, a proper official of the Cabinet. I do not think there is any particular argument on that point. He can designate the man or he may take that position himself. I would rather not take up the time to discuss that.

Mr. GIFFORD. Would that be our man or the Executive's man?

Mr. PHILLIPS. We are living under a system of government which neither I nor the gentleman from Massachusetts can change, and which we do not want to change, in which the legislative department passes the laws and the administrative department executes these laws.

Mr. GIFFORD. Where are we then?

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to remind the gentleman that according to one report which I saw, England sold goods which she received from America under lend-lease and made a profit of \$20,000,000 and that she is using that \$20,000,000 of profit to pay subsidies. There is a vast difference whether a country pays

subsidies from a profit on free goods or by taxpayers' money.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I do not know whether the statement is accurate or not. I do know the report that I hold in my hand says that lend-lease helped Great Britain administer her subsidy program and avoid inflation. I have the record of the United States, Canada, and Great Britain, which shows the friction between the agencies in this country, which is obvious to everyone in the United States, did not exist in England or Canada. The administration was a centralized administration in Great Britain and Canada and not in the United States; that there was a lack of inflationary control in this country which was very important.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has said his solution is to tax the people more than they are being taxed. Now, I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] there is another bill introduced by his colleague [Mr. HERTER] which, if this subsidy were to be imposed, should give a benefit to low-income groups through a stamp plan. As it is now the subsidy program helps the man who is making \$100-a-week income for the first time in his life, in order to keep from hurting the man who is making \$10 a week. It is obviously an unfair program in which the man who has an adequate income is paying somebody to lift the money from the right pocket and put it in the left pocket. There is no reason in the world to pay anybody, or any administrative agency of the Government, for doing that service. That is what the subsidy program is in brief.

I shall leave for another time the description of the exact situation in England, Canada, and Germany, and I will say in conclusion, so that we may at least leave the discussion on a note of humor, that the Office of Price Administration is about to inaugurate an investigation. I have the clipping here, "to conduct a poll of the Nation to get the public's reaction to its rationing regulations."

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. After reading these many speeches of last week, especially the speeches of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and these others, I am worrying about what we are supposed to do about it and what we can do about it. These speeches, to my mind are merely saying that the chauffeur is driving so recklessly. I see no cure for this except to arrest the chauffeur. What is the use of taking the automobile?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that is a good point. Of course, the difference is this, as the gentleman knows: Suppose there are five people in the car. Two of them wish to go in one direction, down a known road, and instruct the chauffeur to that effect, and the other three wish to go in another direction, and try out a road which ends in a bog, and give instructions to the chauffeur to turn. It is

left to the two somehow to persuade one of the other three to go the same direction they want to go.

The job of this House is to persuade, shall I say, enough Members to go our direction and prevent inflation and really help the consumer.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Judd.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman was interrupted before he gave the second of the procedures he felt was necessary to effect a cure. I am interested to hear it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There are four or five. The first is to increase production. It was the method in England; it was the method in Canada; it was the method in Germany; it was the method in the United States during the last war. Second, to return confidence; to assure the farmer that he will get the cost of production; to return confidence to the farmer who, in the last war increased production 55 percent in 1 year. This year he has barely increased it over 2 years ago and over last year. I shall give the suggested remedies another day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARNOLD] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, tonight a distinguished United States Senator speaks on the Congressional Record on the Air program, which is sponsored in this city by Leo Paulin and which is broadcast by Station WHN in New York. This happens to be the fiftieth consecutive broadcast sponsored in that manner. It has provided Members of both Houses on both sides of the aisle with a splendid opportunity to convey their ideas to the listening public.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some additional remarks along this line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to what has been going on throughout this great country of ours in regard to the operation of the present rules and regulations of the Office of Price Administration. Now that the political air has been calmed and quieted

down by talks on both sides, I hope that we can forget the political significations of some of the regulations of the O. P. A. and talk directly to you as to what is going on in the country.

I am proud of the fact that I am one of the boys you cannot take the country out of. It is an impossibility.

The first thing to which I wish to call the attention of the Members is the situation that exists in the capital city of Colorado, Denver. That has a bearing on the O. P. A. price regulations not only in Colorado but throughout the entire United States, and might result in an entire upset of the whole O. P. A. price program. The question is, Has a city the right to levy a tax on the entire citizenry of the incorporated town or city and pay that money to the producers of milk as a direct subsidy to get production? I shall read you what United States District Judge Symes said about this matter, according to an Associated Press report:

DENVER, November 10.—United States District Judge J. Foster Symes today dismissed an injunction suit brought by the Office of Price Administration to prevent collection of a city excise tax of 2 cents a quart above the ceiling price of milk.

The city ordinance is not in direct conflict with O. P. A. regulations, Judge Symes ruled, although he said it was quite apparent the tax would have the effect of a price increase.

The O. P. A. suit against city officials and the milk producers was filed after the city council voted to tax retail milk 2 cents a quart and pass the revenue along to the producers.

The dairymen claimed that they were losing money selling under the ceiling price and that it would be necessary to divert fluid milk usually supplied the Denver vicinity to manufacturers of milk products.

Judge Symes based his ruling upon a clause in the Federal regulations stating that a local tax levied separately and above the ceiling prices is not prohibited.

He compared the city excise tax on milk as similar to the State sales tax on a suit of clothes.

"The Federal Government has the power to say that no tax may be added or imposed above the ceiling price," Symes declared, "but the Administrator has not seen fit to do so."

Clem W. Collins, regional administrator, announced tonight that "either the regional office will appeal to the United States circuit court, or we will take criminal action charging conspiracy."

"The city has a right if they wish to collect a tax and pay it to producers to avert a serious situation threatening Denver," Judge Symes asserted.

Attorney for the O. P. A. argued that the excise tax violated the maximum price ceiling and was a "device to get around regulations."

"If this tax were in direct conflict with Federal regulations," Judge Symes ruled, "the Federal rule would control. This is hardly a price-fixing action, but merely an excise tax imposed on the theory of benefiting the general public."

City Attorney Malcolm Lindsey and Attorney Nelson told the court earlier that the city ordinance was valid under the police power of a home-rule city.

"The State and city have never surrendered their sovereignty to protect the lives of those in the community," Nelson declared.

The O. P. A. admitted that production costs to the dairymen had not been determined because of the "lack of records" kept by the producers.

Truitt stated, however, that a subsidy and a slight increase granted the producers by the O. P. A. guaranteed them a larger income than that they would obtain by selling to the manufacturers.

I thought it would be a good idea for the Members of the House to have the attitude that Judge Symes took toward this particular case.

I call your attention to other matters that are going on in this milk situation facing our people. I notice—and I have no reason to doubt these figures—that the city of San Francisco is 20,000 gallons of milk short daily; the city of San Diego is 18,000 gallons of milk short daily; and the city of Los Angeles is 12,000 gallons of milk short daily. Get those figures in your minds. What do they mean? They simply mean that the men who are producing the fluid milk in that territory are gradually being forced out of business.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that those shortages in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego are in addition to other shortages created and unfilled; that is, the request of the Army for milk for transports.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I wish to compliment the gentleman on bringing to the attention of the House the matter of milk. We are having a great deal of difficulty in getting milk in New Hampshire and other sections of New England. May I ask the gentleman this question?

Does not the gentleman think that if the O. P. A. would readjust its prices, or if we could force it to readjust its price structure as far as milk is concerned, that it would stimulate production and that we would have a great deal more milk?

Mr. HILL. Oh, that is correct. These regulations are the greatest obstacle. The greatest obstacle against production of any kind, whether in milk, shoes, clothing, sugar, or any type of production in the price regulations of O. P. A. The first absolute, sensible rule is production. You must have production. I will show you another way that you can get production in milk, because if you can prove this thing is wrong in milk regulating, maybe we can bring some judgment and sane reasoning into the minds of the boys in the O. P. A. who are getting their first-grade education in how to control marketing in a complicated economic system such as ours.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman has referred to the situation that exists in Denver. A similar situation exists in one of the cities in my own State. One city in Oregon found itself without milk completely, as most of the dairies had gone out of business. The city went into

the business and bought the dairies itself, and the city is running those dairies now. Is it the gentleman's idea that under the O. P. A. regulations they are running them contrary to law?

Mr. HILL. Oh, according to the Denver decision, they have a right to protect the health and the lives of the citizens of that city.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I have a great deal of correspondence with dairies in my own district in Missouri. Some of them have gone out of business entirely there because, as they say, they are following the example of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, who does not find the operation of a dairy very profitable.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. The farmer has many troubles. He says, for instance, he has to know the botanical name of the crop that he raises, and then he has to know the entomological name of the insects that eat it, and he has to know the chemical name of the poison which will kill the insects, but he says that the worse sort of insects that he has to cope with are the humbugs here in Washington, and that he cannot get rid of them.

Mr. HILL. And I know of no spray material that would kill them off. If I did, I would give the gentleman the remedy. There is another suggestion that has to do with the trouble in the milk-distribution problem, and with that I shall close the milk angle of my remarks. I refer now to the State of Georgia. Some interesting information came to me in respect to that, and I hope that my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is listening, because I discovered by reading the item I have in mind that they are shipping 3.5 plus milk into Atlanta, Ga., from Wisconsin, and getting as high as 47 to 50 cents a gallon.

Also I notice that they are shipping about 3.5 or 3.7 milk from the State of Maryland to Atlanta, and getting close to 50 cents a gallon, and the men who are producing fluid milk for Atlanta, and who live in the Atlanta milkshed, are permitted only 36 cents per gallon for 4.5 milk. You can see what the trouble is, no sound business regulations or men with the proper background of experience to properly direct such a program. The regulations are unworkable, unreasonable, and unnecessary.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Referring again to the Denver decision, I notice that the O. P. A. has appealed that case. Analyzing the situation, it seems to me that the Denver authorities have resorted to a subsidy. Inasmuch as the Administration is now favoring subsidies, I wonder why they are not consistent, and why they fight this subsidy. Could it be because of political reasons in that the Administration does not get credit for

the payment thereof and therefore cannot expect it to be a possible vote getter?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman answers his own question. I shall not bring any political argument into my statement because this goes deeper than politics. It is neither Democratic nor Republican. This thing is fundamental, and has a serious effect upon our economic system. I am convinced that if this Congress allows this thing to continue—and that is our responsibility—and this sort of price regulation is to be forced on the producers of the country, we are not only going to wipe out the farming class, but will change our whole economic system, and, I am afraid, the very foundation of our democracy.

The meat-pricing program is another perfect example of price-control bungling.

I refer now to an article which I read this morning in the Washington Post, to the effect that 500 representatives of agriculture, mostly livestock producers, are in the Capital today. I ask you, Why these men are here, in the face of the manpower shortage on the farms? Why are these men forced to come down here to protect their industry? They are afraid of new regulations or new plans that will be forced upon them.

And the press this morning gave some interesting interviews with these men. It says here:

Representatives of all the livestock groups said that should the O. P. A. regulations continue, next year will see the beginning of reduction of herds to the point that it will take many years to build them up again to normalcy.

W. D. Farr, president of the Colorado-Nebraska Lamb Feeders Association, said there is now a 15-percent shortage of lambs on feeding ranges. He blamed high feed costs and fixed O. P. A. ceilings for what he called a "chaotic situation" in the industry.

The next article I want to call to your attention is a news release this morning which has been mentioned before, that is, concerning the smallest production of sugar beets since 1928:

SMALLEST BEET PRODUCTION FOR UNITED STATES SINCE 1928

WASHINGTON, November 11.—Decreased sugar-beet acreages indicate a 1943 production of 7,239,000 tons, smallest since 1928, the United States Department of Agriculture reports.

Last year's crop totaled 11,681,000 tons.

The Department said acreage reductions were primarily responsible for the production slump, since the per-acre yield for 1943 is expected to be 12.1 tons, against 12.3 tons last year.

By States, the indicated production and per-acre yield for 1943 includes:

Montana, 649,000 tons and 11-ton yield; Wyoming, 312,000, and 12.5; Colorado, 1,701,000, and 12.6.

With all these scarcities of necessary food products facing the people of this country, can this Congress refuse to bring out a bill that has been lying peacefully in the Rules Committee since last summer? I know we had an argument awhile ago about the program on the floor of this House. There is no excuse in the world for the failure to act on the Fulmer bill which would remedy the

chaotic condition now existing in the various departments attempting to regulate and control our prices. We have too many regulations emanating from various departments, bureaus, and agencies. And few of these agencies have the proper coordination or cooperation with each other in issuing edicts, regulations, and programs affecting an entire industry.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I do.

Mr. BREHM. May I point out one ruling of the O. P. A.: The sugar-beet growers in Ohio came to me and wanted to know if there was not something we could do to permit them to raise more sugar beets. They were denied the right to plant or raise sugar beets. They were paid a subsidy not to raise sugar beets and yet they come along and ration sugar to us. If that makes sense, then I do not know what I am talking about.

Mr. HILL. I wanted to talk just a minute about price control. I think one thing we should understand first before we talk about subsidies. We should define what we are talking about. What do you mean, "price control"? Do you mean price control at the producer's end? Do you mean price control between the producer and the distributor; that is, price control for the distributor? Or do you mean price control to the consumer? Let us get that absolutely straight. I want to know what you are talking about. Secondly, when you are talking of subsidies, what are you talking about? Are you talking about subsidies to the consumer who has more money in his pockets than he ever had in the history of the United States, or are you talking about subsidies for the farmers who are now working under more strenuous conditions than they ever worked heretofore, with less help and less machinery? If you are talking about that, that is another thing altogether. I think in the many speeches I have heard on the floor of this House on subsidies, no one explained whether he was talking about producer subsidy which we must have to get production of lead, copper, and zinc, and many other products; or whether he was talking about roll-back of prices to the laboring classes and other classes who are receiving the highest salaries they have ever had in the history of this great Nation of ours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SETTLEMENT OF WAR CLAIMS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, upon one war policy I believe we can all agree—that it is the duty of the Congress, as far as it lies within its power, to prevent, or, failing in that, to reduce to a minimum, monetary losses by American citizens, the consequence of enemy action.

In the hope that those ends may be promoted, I am today introducing a bill which will, if enacted into law, make re-

sponsive in the liquidation of such losses all enemy property in our possession, and in addition thereto, provide a means for the swift adjudication in American courts of all of such claims according to Anglo-Saxon justice.

At the close of the First World War the Congress blundered on this issue, and as a result Americans who then suffered losses in lives and property as a consequence of enemy action have not yet been made whole, because, in the passage of the Settlement of the War Claims Act of 1928 we let slip through our fingers German money and property in amounts and of value more than ample to have satisfied all claims in full. We simply fell for false promises and, in blind faith, returned 80 percent of the theretofore seized German property to its original owners. A half billion dollars of worthless German bonds lie in our Treasury as evidence of the fraud which was then perpetrated on us.

We were guided by our hearts, not our heads, in yielding to the fallacious argument that to do otherwise would violate the historic policy of the United States, which, so they said, requires us to hold immune from confiscation enemy private property seized in time of war. It is not at all surprising that then Members of this House, including the present distinguished Secretary of State and a former Vice President of the United States, assailed this and other misleading arguments, and the latter branded the proposed surrender of seized alien properties to their former owners as a "stupendous steal, the greatest in the history of this country."

The whole subject has been recently reviewed in an article in the Bankers Magazine entitled "American Property Claims Against Germany and the Coming Peace Treaty." It was written by Harold G. Aron, an eminent lawyer of New York City, and his associate, Frederick W. Eisner. For its precise statement of the facts which poses the problem and the well-thought-through solution which it suggests, there has been much generous and well-deserved praise in high position, on the bench, and at the bar, including the Federal judiciary. Impressed by this splendid analysis of an intricate legislative problem, I have embodied many of its recommendations in the bill to which I have just referred, confident that in them is to be found the solution which will be deemed the just one as between aggressor and aggrieved.

Its purpose is to prevent a reoccurrence of the stupidities and scandals which grew out of the mishandling of seized enemy property during and after the First World War. Its objective is to protect American citizens and gain for them all attainable compensation for the private losses they have suffered by acts of our enemies.

It will accomplish other things of great importance; speed and justice in adjudicating such claims, by avoiding the trap of another mixed claims commission such as we set up by agreement with Germany in 1922, and it will not let justice be determined or delayed by shadowy concepts of international law, or the

civil or commercial code of Germany or the municipal laws of enemy countries.

It will permit injured citizens to prove their own losses in their own way before American courts and not through Government agents before a so-called international tribunal.

But, it will do more than all this, if promptly enacted. It will quickly and completely Americanize the ownership of patents, plants, secret formulas, internationally known trade names and other properties of great value in time to permit us to thoroughly prepare ourselves for the great struggle to break up European cartels, crafty conspiracies against free enterprise that they are, when we enter the commercial struggle for our share of world trade when this war ends.

It will do more; it will hasten the end of the war by breaking the hearts of Nazi and Nipponese bankers and industrialists and moneyed interests, who, relying on a repetition of our ill-conceived performances following World War No. 1, treasure the hope that we will be fools enough to again give them back their properties, to be used again, as after the last war, to build anew their financial, industrial and war machinery to that point where they will be strong enough to again aggress against us.

I hope the bill will have immediate consideration and that none will give ear to the foolish contention that United States property in enemy and enemy occupied countries exceeds in value enemy property in the United States and that, therefore, no action should be taken now, since, so they say, the policy of non-confiscation is the course of enlightened self-interest. No thought of confiscation exists in the bill I introduce. No question of confiscation is involved. As but a hasty glance at the measure will reveal, the bill requires that defeated enemy governments shall compensate their own nationals for any losses suffered by them as a consequence of the seizure of their property as enemy property by virtue of American legal action.

At the time the nonconfiscation argument was advanced in the Seventy-first Congress, the then Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Garrard B. Winston, was asked by Mr. Garner:

Is it confiscation of property for us to carry out the provisions of a treaty where the German Government itself obligates itself to pay its citizens on account of our taking this property?

The Under Secretary of the Treasury replied:

If you take the property of an individual citizen to pay the debts of his government and his government reimburses him for the property taken, there is no inequity.

Again, how can it be said that not to use this enemy property to pay losses of American citizens suffered through enemy action is a sound moral principle? Are we to give back this property and let American citizens go totally uncompensated; or are we to compensate them out of the inexhaustible United States Treasury and make American taxpayers pay the losses caused by enemy governments, while the nationals of those countries get their properties back less only

a custodian's charge of one-half of 1 percent, as they did to the extent of 80 percent when Germany made its former bid for world mastery?

Finally, how can it be reasoned that self-interest should deter us from using funds derived from the sale of enemy property to satisfy claims arising out of losses of American citizens as a consequence of enemy action? American property in Germany has been for all practical purposes, sequestered for 10 years, to the extent that the owner could not get either it or its earnings out of Germany. The seizure became, factually, if not theoretically, actual confiscation the instant war was declared. So convinced of this American owners have become, that careful corporate managements have actually written their plants and properties in enemy and enemy-occupied countries off their books. Victory will change all this.

It is true that our properties there exceed the value of seized enemy property here, but does any one think we are not going to win this war and dictate the peace? Does anyone assume these American properties would be given back to us if the Axis Powers were victorious? What basis, save ludicrous defeatism, is there for fear of Axis reprisals and German confiscation of United States overseas property if we do in fact apply to the liquidation of the losses of our people alien-owned property now in our possession?

No one who knows whereof he speaks would contend but that we have, as held in repeated opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States, the unquestioned right to dispose of such properties as we please? And this we must do unless we are prepared to sentence thousands of American citizens, victims of Axis aggression, to go uncompensated for losses suffered as a consequence of enemy action. Once we failed miserably to protect our fellows. Are we to repeat again that same folly?

Already the Alien Property Custodian has seized over 150,000 items of foreign-owned property, seizures and freezing orders covering an over-all value of more than \$7,000,000,000. The simple question which my bill raises is: Shall all this be returned to their former enemy owners or shall these properties be sold to the highest bidders and the funds thus realized applied to the reduction of the losses sustained by our fellow American citizens as a consequence of enemy action?

In the last analysis, it is Uncle Sam or Uncle Sap. Which shall it be?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wish to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that there also would be involved the use, for the great public good, of certain patents, chemical formulas, and medical processes in the procedure such as you suggest?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes. I failed to mention that the bill I have drawn provides that whenever the President is of the opinion that a patent should not be sold, it should be retained and licensed to American manufacturers, or, should it be deemed advisable, it might be released to the public domain.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Was not that policy followed very advantageously in the last war?

Mr. GEARHART. In respect to a very, very few items of property seized. In respect to those few the results have been of untold benefit to the American people. The thing I object to is turning back alien enemy property to its former owners, property which represents money invested in the United States, the returns from which largely financed the war for our enemies, the war which we are now fighting, while American citizens who have suffered great damage as a consequence of enemy war action remain uncompensated for their losses, even to this day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to include in my extension of remarks a letter from the War Department and certain other brief excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD a speech made by the master of the National Grange, Mr. Goss, at Grand Rapids, Mich., before the seventy-seventh annual session of the National Grange. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that this will cost \$450. I ask permission that it be included notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein certain documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POST-WAR ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HISTORY IN THE MAKING—UNCLE SAM ADOPTS A FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to discuss briefly the epochal happenings that have taken place recently with reference to our foreign policy and our participation with the free nations of the world in a program to maintain peace and prevent aggression in the post-war world. It may now be truthfully said that Uncle Sam has indeed adopted a foreign policy. History is being made. In the last month alone events have taken place with which we in America have played a leading part, which may well shape the course of his-

tory for a century to come. World happenings are taking place in rapid succession in theaters of action involving all the peoples of the world, which are making necessary the adoption by the United States of a program and world policy by which its action will be governed in the post-war world.

The agreement reached in Moscow and in both Houses of the American Congress has crystallized an American foreign policy more far-reaching than any upon which we have embarked since the Nation was formed over 150 years ago. When the history of this crucial period in world history shall have been written the formulation of this world-wide foreign policy will take its place with such great events in our national history as the Declaration of Independence, the Monroe Doctrine, and the abolition of slavery and the preservation of the Union. The Monroe Doctrine has played an important role as a national policy. It, however, was applicable only to the Western Hemisphere. The foreign policy embodied in the Moscow agreement and the Fulbright and Connally resolutions is world-wide in its application.

The House of Representatives first took up the consideration of this most important problem of our part in world cooperation when it passed the Fulbright resolution. This resolution provided:

That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

The significance of the adoption by the House of this first official pronouncement of our world-wide policy in the post-war world was not so much that it was adopted by the House but that there were only 29 votes out of 435 in opposition. The action of the House made clear that this Nation not only has made a major contribution in blood and resources to the preservation of world civilization and the winning of the war but that it intends to follow through in the post-war world and by its influence, cooperation, and participation in international machinery make certain so far as it is humanly possible that there shall not be visited upon the world another catastrophe such as this world war which is bringing death and desolation to the world. We in the Congress and the American people whom we represent are determined to leave nothing undone that will insure permanent world peace and outlaw aggression by the gangster nations of the world. We want to make sure our boys shall not have died in vain.

The historic conference at Moscow and the declaration concluded there between the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and China make certain that the major members of the United Nations are determined to stand together, not only in winning the war with unconditional surrender of our enemies and complete victory over them and the stamping out of national gangsterism, but also they intend to stand

together in full cooperation in the post-war world to establish and maintain peace and security and prevent aggression in order to insure a better world in which all of the peoples of the world may live together in peace and cooperation and the enjoyment of the blessings and economic resources which a peaceful world provides.

The representatives of the United Nations, in formulating this understanding, said:

JOINT FOUR-NATION DECLARATION

The Governments of the United States of America, United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China, united in their determination, in accordance with the declaration by the United Nations of January 1, 1942, and subsequent declarations, to continue hostilities against those Axis Powers with which they respectively are at war until such powers have laid down their arms on the basis of unconditional surrender; conscious of their responsibility to secure the liberation of themselves and the peoples allied with them from the menace of aggression; recognizing the necessity of insuring a rapid and orderly transition from war to peace and of establishing and maintaining international peace and security with the least diversion of the world's human and economic resources for armaments; jointly declare—

1. That their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security.

2. That those of them at war with a common enemy will act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of that enemy.

3. That they will take all measures deemed by them to be necessary to provide against any violation of the terms imposed upon the enemy.

4. That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

5. That for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security pending the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security, they will consult with one another and as occasion requires with other members of the United Nations with a view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations.

6. That after the termination of hostilities they will not employ their military forces within the territories of other states except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation.

7. That they will confer and cooperate with one another and with other members of the United Nations to bring about a practicable general agreement with respect to the regulation of armaments in the post-war period.

The Department of State of the United States released the following declarations and statements on the Moscow Conference at the time it released the Moscow Joint Four-Nation Declaration:

ANGLO-SOVIET-AMERICAN COMMUNIQUE ON THE CONFERENCE IN MOSCOW OF THE THREE FOREIGN SECRETARIES

The Conference of Foreign Secretaries of the United States of America, Mr. Cordell Hull; of the United Kingdom, Mr. Anthony Eden; and of the Soviet Union, Mr. V. M. Molotov, took place at Moscow from the 19th to 30th of October 1943. There were 12 meetings. In addition to the Foreign Secretaries, the following took part in the conference:

For the United States of America: Mr. W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador of the United States; Maj. Gen. John R. Deane, United States Army; Mr. Green H. Hackworth, Mr. James C. Dunn, and experts.

For the United Kingdom: Sir Archibald Clark Kerr, Ambassador; Mr. William Strang; Lt. Gen. Sir Hastings Ismay; and experts.

For the Soviet Union: Marshal K. E. Voroshilov, Marshal of the Soviet Union; Mr. A. Y. Vyshinski, Mr. M. M. Litvinov, Deputy People's Commissars for Foreign Affairs; Mr. V. A. Sergeev, Deputy People's Commissar for Foreign Trade; Maj. Gen. A. A. Gryzlov, of the General Staff; Mr. G. F. Saskin, Senior Official of People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs; and experts.

The agenda included all questions submitted for discussion by the three Governments. Some of the questions called for final decisions, and these were taken. On other questions, after discussion, decisions of principle were taken. These questions were referred for detailed consideration to commissions specially set up for the purpose, or reserved for treatment through diplomatic channels. Other questions again were disposed of by an exchange of views. The Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union have been in close cooperation in all matters concerning the common war effort, but this is the first time that the Foreign Secretaries of the three Governments have been able to meet together in conference.

In the first place, there were frank and exhaustive discussions of the measures to be taken to shorten the war against Germany and her satellites in Europe. Advantage was taken of the presence of military advisers representing the respective Chiefs of Staffs in order to discuss definite military operations with regard to which decisions had been taken and which are already being prepared in order to create a basis for the closest military cooperation in the future between the three countries.

Second only to the importance of hastening the end of the war was the recognition by the three Governments that it was essential in their own national interests and in the interest of all peace-loving nations to continue the present close collaboration and cooperation in the conduct of the war into the period following the end of hostilities, and that only in this way could peace be maintained and the political, economic, and social welfare of their peoples fully promoted.

This conviction is expressed in a declaration in which the Chinese Government joined during the conference and which was signed by the three Foreign Secretaries and the Chinese Ambassador at Moscow on behalf of their Governments. This declaration, published today, provides for even closer collaboration in the prosecution of the war and in all matters pertaining to the surrender and disarmament of the enemies with which the four countries are respectively at war. It set forth the principles upon which the four Governments agree that a broad system of international cooperation and security should be based. Provision is made for the inclusion of all other peace-loving nations, great and small, in this system.

The conference agreed to set up machinery for insuring the closest cooperation between the three Governments in the examination of European questions arising as the war develops. For this purpose the conference decided to establish in London a European Advisory Commission to study these questions and to make joint recommendations to the three Governments.

Provision was made for continuing when necessary the tripartite consultations of representatives of the three Governments in the respective capitals through the existing diplomatic channels.

The conference also agreed to establish an Advisory Council for matters relating to Italy to be composed in the first instance of repre-

sentatives of their three Governments and of the French Committee of National Liberation. Provision is made for addition to this council of representatives of Greece and Yugoslavia in view of their special interests arising out of aggressions of Fascist Italy upon their territory during the present war. This council will deal with day-to-day questions other than military preparations and will make recommendations designed to co-ordinate Allied policy with regard to Italy.

The three Foreign Secretaries considered it appropriate to reaffirm by a declaration published today the attitude of the Allied Governments in favor of the restoration of democracy in Italy.

The three Foreign Secretaries declared it to be the purpose of their Governments to restore the independence of Austria. At the same time they reminded Austria that in the final settlement account will be taken of efforts that Austria may make toward its own liberation. The declaration on Austria is published today.

The Foreign Secretaries issued at the conference a declaration by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin containing a solemn warning that at the time of granting any armistice to any German Government, those German officers and men and members of the Nazi Party who have had any connection with atrocities and executions in countries overrun by German forces will be taken back to the countries in which their abominable crimes were committed to be charged and punished according to the laws of those countries.

In an atmosphere of mutual confidence and understanding, which characterized all the work of the conference, consideration was also given to other important questions. These included not only questions of a current nature but also questions concerning treatment of Hitlerite Germany and its satellites, economic cooperation, and assurance of general peace.

STATEMENT SIGNED BY PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT, PRIME MINISTER CHURCHILL, AND PREMIER STALIN REGARDING ATROCITIES

The United Kingdom, the United States, and the Soviet Union have received from many quarters evidence of atrocities, massacres, and cold-blooded mass executions which are being perpetrated by Hitlerite forces in many of the countries they have overrun and from which they are now being steadily expelled. The brutalities of Hitlerite domination are no new thing and all peoples or territories in their grip have suffered from the worst form of government by terror. What is new is that many of these territories are now being redeemed by the advancing armies of the liberating powers and that in their desperation, the recoiling Hitlerite Huns are redoubling their ruthless cruelties. This is now evidenced with particular clearness by monstrous crimes of the Hitlerites on the territory of the Soviet Union which is being liberated from Hitlerites, and on French and Italian territory.

Accordingly, the aforesaid 3 Allied Powers, speaking in the interests of the 33 United Nations, hereby solemnly declare and give full warning of their declaration as follows: At the time of granting of any armistice to any government which may be set up in Germany, those German officers and men and members of the Nazi Party who have been responsible for or have taken a consenting part in the above atrocities, massacres, and executions will be sent back to the countries in which their abominable deeds were done in order that they may be judged and punished according to the laws of these liberated countries and of the free governments which will be erected therein. Lists will be compiled in all possible detail from all these countries, having regard especially to invaded parts of the Soviet Union, to Poland and Czechoslovakia, to Yugoslavia

and Greece, including Crete and other islands, to Norway, Denmark, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, France, and Italy.

Thus, Germans who take part in wholesale shooting of Polish officers or in the execution of French, Dutch, Belgian, or Norwegian hostages or of Cretan peasants, or who have shared in slaughters inflicted on the people of Poland or in territories of the Soviet Union which are now being swept clear of the enemy, will know they will be brought back to the scene of their crimes and judged on the spot by the peoples whom they have outraged. Let those who have hitherto not imbrued their hands with innocent blood beware lest they join the ranks of the guilty, for most assuredly the three Allied Powers will pursue them to the uttermost ends of the earth and will deliver them to their accusers in order that justice may be done.

The above declaration is without prejudice to the case of German criminals, whose offenses have no particular geographical localization and who will be punished by joint decision of the Governments of the Allies.

DECLARATION REGARDING ITALY

The Foreign Secretaries of the United States, United Kingdom, and Soviet Union have established that their three Governments are in complete agreement that Allied policy toward Italy must be based upon the fundamental principle that fascism and all its evil influence and configuration shall be completely destroyed and that the Italian people shall be given every opportunity to establish governmental and other institutions based upon democratic principles.

The Foreign Secretaries of the United States and United Kingdom declare that the action of their Governments from the inception of the invasion of Italian territory, insofar as paramount military requirements have permitted has been based upon this policy.

In furtherance of this policy in the future the Foreign Secretaries of the three Governments are agreed that the following measures are important and should be put into effect:

1. It is essential that the Italian Government should be made more democratic by inclusion of representatives of those sections of the Italian people who have always opposed fascism.
2. Freedom of speech, of religious worship, of political belief, of press, and of public meeting shall be restored in full measure to the Italian people who shall also be entitled to form anti-Fascist political groups.
3. All institutions and organizations created by the Fascist regime shall be suppressed.
4. All Fascist or pro-Fascist elements shall be removed from the administration and from institutions and organizations of a public character.
5. All political prisoners of the Fascist regime shall be released and accorded full amnesty.
6. Democratic organs of local government shall be created.
7. Fascist chiefs and army generals known or suspected to be war criminals shall be arrested and handed over to justice.

In making this declaration the three Foreign Secretaries recognize that so long as active military operations continue in Italy the time at which it is possible to give full effect to the principles stated above will be determined by the Commander in Chief on the basis of instructions received through the Combined Chiefs of Staff.

The three Governments, parties to this declaration, will, at the request of any one of them, consult on this matter. It is further understood that nothing in this resolution is to operate against the right of the Italian people, ultimately to choose their own form of government.

DECLARATION ON AUSTRIA

The Governments of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and the United States of America are agreed that Austria, the first free country to fall a victim to Hitlerite aggression, shall be liberated from German domination.

They regard the annexation imposed on Austria by Germany on March 15, 1938, as null and void. They consider themselves as in no way bound by any changes effected in Austria since that date. They declare that they wish to see reestablished a free and independent Austria and thereby to open the way for the Austrian people themselves, as well as those neighboring states which will be faced with similar problems, to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for lasting peace.

Austria is reminded, however, that she has a responsibility, which she cannot evade, for participation in the war at the side of Hitlerite Germany, and that in the final settlement account will inevitably be taken of her own contribution to her liberation.

While the conference in Moscow was in progress, the Senate of the United States was engaged in its historic debate on the Connally resolution, which has for its purpose a pronouncement by the Senate as to the foreign policy that should be followed by this Nation in cooperation with the United Nations, now engaged in the throes of World War No. 2. No debate in all our eventful history was of greater significance. At the conclusion of this debate and after the release to the world of the Moscow agreement, the vote was taken on the modified Connally resolution, and only five of the Members of the Senate cast a negative vote.

The text of the Senate resolution as adopted is as follows:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

In this connection it should be remembered that the foreign policy of our country under the Constitution is formulated by the Chief Executive, but any treaties negotiated by the Chief Executive must be submitted to the Senate and approved by two-thirds of its membership present. The overwhelming majority of the membership of the Senate voting its approval of this foreign policy is of utmost significance in connection

with such treaties as may follow the cessation of activities and the consummation of international accords putting into operation agreements arrived at between the United Nations. The absence of any political lines of demarkation in the formulation and adoption of this international collaboration in the post-war world is also significant. It definitely established that the maintenance of world peace and the stamping out of international aggression is not a political question.

One of the two great political parties—the Republican—acting through its advisory council, in the recent Mackinac meeting, laid down a definite foreign policy by unanimous agreement, even before the resolutions to which I have referred were adopted. The Mackinac Charter is forthright, clear, and nonpartisan and is in the following words:

MACKINAC CHARTER

The members of this council are aware of the gravity of the problems our Nation faces. We are fighting a desperate war, which must be won as speedily as possible. When the war is ended we must participate in the making of the peace. This puts upon the Nation a triple responsibility.

(A) We must preserve and protect all our own national interests.

(B) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

(C) We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.

At this time a detailed program for the accomplishment of these great objectives will be impossible and specific commitments of this council of the Republican Party, or by the Nation, would be unwise. We cannot know now what situation may obtain at the war's end. But a specific program must be devolved in the months to come as events and relations unfold.

Therefore, we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an advisory council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:

1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including—

(A) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis.

(B) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacturing of the implements of war.

(C) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperation organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

In making this recommendation we ground our judgment upon the belief that both the foreign policy and domestic policy of every country are related to each other so closely that each member of the United Nations (or whatever cooperative organization perpetuating existing unity may be agreed upon) ought to consider both the immediate and remote consequences of every proposition with careful regard for—

1. Its effect upon the vital interests of the Nation.

2. Its bearing upon the foreseeable international developments.

If there should be a conflict between the two, then the United States of America should adhere to the policy which will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and the Bill of Rights, as administered through our republican form of government. Constitutionalism should be adhered to in

determining the substance of our policies and shall be followed in ways and means of making international commitments.

In addition to these things, this council advises that peace and security ought to be ultimately established upon other sanctions than force. It recommends that we work toward a policy which will comprehend other means than war for the determination of international controversy, and the attainment of a peace that will prevail by virtue of its inherent reciprocal interests and its spiritual foundation, reached from time to time with the understanding of the people of the negotiating nations.

In all of these undertakings we favor the widest consultation of the gallant men and women in our armed forces who have a special right to speak with authority on behalf of the security and liberty for which they fight.

It is determined that this council make complete examination of the means by which these ends may be fully achieved with due regard for all American interests and responsibilities.

The council invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness.

The agreement between the dominant members of the United Nations on this policy of cooperation to maintain peace and prevent aggression in the post-war world, supported as it is by an overwhelming majority of the American people of all political faiths, gives hopeful assurance that our sacrifice of lives and resources shall not have been in vain and that we may look forward to a more peaceful world in the decades that are to follow. It is also of great military significance. It is of great strategic importance in bringing the conflict now raging on foreign battlefields to a successful and early termination. Nothing of greater importance has occurred in recent months than the assurance given to the world, and particularly our enemies, that we, the United Nations, are standing adamant together with a full determination to fight on, with no separate peace, until full and complete victory shall crown our efforts. The unity of purpose of the major powers of the United Nations, proof of which was heretofore lacking, is a severe blow to the morale of the Nazi forces, not surpassed by a major military victory.

The representatives of the United Nations who filled the important roles in the formulation and adoption of these world policies have performed a service which will enrich the whole world for many generations if the mandates of the policies are observed.

ALASKA HIGHWAY

Mr. Speaker, some time ago I called the attention of the House to a recent trip made by me during the recess of the Congress, through Alaska, as a member of the House Committee on Territories and the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife. I was happy to take advantage of the cessation of work here to make an inspection trip through this important and strategic area. The Alaska Highway extending for 1,630 miles from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to

Fairbanks, Alaska, is now being used throughout its entire length for military purposes. The construction of this military road through the uninhabited rough terrain over most of this long distance is a remarkable achievement not only as an engineering project carried forward by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army during war but also as a project planned and programed by the Public Roads Administration. The actual work of construction was carried forward both by the Army engineers and by private contract through civilian workers. On Saturday, November 13, the Northwest Service Command under the charge of Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, made a news release making known to the world that this farthest north through-bus service over the entire 1,630 miles of the highway was put into operation last week and Greyhound busses chartered by the American Army began regular service from Dawson Creek to Fairbanks, Alaska. I was privileged during my trip last summer to make the entire journey of approximately 1,000 miles from Whitehorse south to Peace River Bridge near Dawson Creek, and was most favorably impressed by the outstanding accomplishment in road building under adverse conditions as evidenced by the successful opening of the highway through its entire length in such a short space of time. The news release of the Northwest Service Command is an important item of news and I include the report as a part of my remarks. The report is as follows:

WHITEHORSE, YUKON TERRITORY, November 13.—The farthest north through bus service in the world was put in operation this week, when Greyhound busses chartered by the American Army began rolling into Fairbanks on the Alaska Highway.

For the past 3 months the busses have been plying steadily between Dawson Creek, British Columbia, the southern terminus of the famous international road, and Whitehorse in the Yukon Territory. This stretch covers approximately 1,000 miles. Whitehorse is the main base along the highway and the headquarters of Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor's Northwest Service Command.

This week the bus service was extended on to Fairbanks, thus lengthening the total trip to 1,630 miles. The journey over the entire highway is not only the world's farthest north bus service but also one of the longest through bus journeys anywhere in North America. Most of it is in the sub-Arctic.

Travel on the Alaska Highway busses is confined to military personnel, civilian construction workers, and others associated with the war effort. No commercial or tourist traffic is carried. "For the duration of the war," General O'Connor declared, "travel on the highway will be restricted to military requirements. This is by joint agreement of the Governments of the United States and Canada. The road was built for military purposes and will be used accordingly."

The busses traveling on the Alaska Highway are the largest size Greyhounds, the same as those which serve such Canadian and American centers as Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver, Seattle, Omaha, Chicago, and Atlanta. The busses have been leased from the Greyhound Bus Corporation but are operated by the Northwest Service Command.

Col. Joseph P. Glandon, of Portland, Oreg., is the officer in charge of transportation on the Alaska Highway, and the busses operate directly under his management. This week

Glandon, whose headquarters are at Dawson Creek, released figures showing the magnitude of the present bus traffic on the famous international road.

During the month of September 1943 the busses hauled more than 6,500 individual passengers a total of 2,159,622 passenger-miles. This included troops going to duty and on furlough, and civilian workers traveling to and from such vital construction jobs as the airports between Edmonton and Fairbanks and the Canol pipe-line project. The bus line goes through three separate sovereignties—the Province of British Columbia, the Yukon Territory, and the Territory of Alaska.

The drivers of the Alaska Highway busses are men recruited from regular Greyhound runs in western Canada. The bulk of them make their homes in five Canadian cities—Calgary, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Vancouver, and Lethbridge. These drivers ride the busses in pairs. There are always two men on each bus. One man drives while the other sleeps or rests. Two sets of hands are essential in the extreme temperatures of the far North—temperatures which often crowd 60° below zero—when repairs are necessary or tire blow-outs occur.

Between Dawson Creek and Whitehorse, the busses operate over three separate divisions. The first is from Dawson Creek to Fort Nelson; the second from Fort Nelson to Watson Lake; the third from Watson Lake to Whitehorse. On the new run to Fairbanks being inaugurated this week, the division point midway between Whitehorse and Fairbanks will be the Army airport and highway relay station at Northway, Alaska. Last winter Northway was the coldest point along the 1,630 miles of road, the temperature once dropping to 70° below.

The teams of drivers change at the division points. For example, on a typical recent bus trip to Whitehorse, a bus loaded with Air Corps men on their way to duty was driven as far as Fort Nelson by E. R. Bavin, of Edmonton, and Grant Thompson, of Cranbrook, British Columbia. The bus then was piloted on to Watson Lake by Ray and Fraser Maxwell, brothers, of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. On the final lap to Whitehorse, the drivers were William Cherlenko, of Lethbridge, and Fred Emms, of Calgary.

In addition to the busses leased from the Greyhound lines, the American Army is operating a number of smaller busses on shorter runs between intermediate points on the road. These busses, some of which once served American shipyards, also carry troops and workers around such large posts as Whitehorse and Edmonton.

On the long stretch between Dawson Creek and Whitehorse, the Greyhound busses have been going straight through without any stops other than to take on gasoline or for meals at Army relay stations. In recent weeks the approximately 1,000 miles have been covered in 44 hours elapsed time. The passengers, soldiers and civilians alike, get their meals at the Army relay stations along the road.

Few bus routes contain such a wide variety of scenery. The start of the journey from the Northern Alberta railhead at Dawson Creek, end of steel in the north country, is across the wide Canadian plains. Wheat farms dot the landscape. The bus rolls majestically across the graceful, half-mile-long suspension bridge spanning the Peace River and continues over the prairie.

But gradually the scene grows wilder. The farms fade out. Forests begin to encroach on the fields and pastures. The plains stiffen into high hills. At Fort Nelson, where the road turns sharply westward toward Alaska, the wilderness has become dominant. Between Fort Nelson and Watson Lake the road ascends the Continental Divide. It twists through canyons and steep river valleys. It

follows narrow creeks and deep arroyos. Gaunt peaks guard the horizon.

The bus glides past the historic old Hudson Bay store at Lower Post, stops briefly at the big airport at Watson Lake, and continues across the Yukon uplands in the direction of Whitehorse. This is the land made famous by the gold seekers who struggled into the Klondike in 1898—a land immortalized by Jack London, Robert W. Service, and James Oliver Curwood. Just east of Whitehorse the bus crosses the headwaters of the mighty Yukon River, the first bus service ever to penetrate this wilderness watershed.

Many noted Americans and Canadians have ridden on the Alaska Highway busses on journeys of varying length since they first were put into service.

They include such names as the Governor General of Canada, the Earl of Athlone, and his wife, the Princess Alice; Senator James G. Scruggs, of Nevada; Senator William Langer, of North Dakota; Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; Senator Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; Senator C. Douglass Buck, of Delaware; Congressman Homer D. Angell, of Oregon; Delegate Anthony J. Diamond, of Alaska; Mayor F. H. LaGuardia, of New York City, chairman of the Joint Defense Board; Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Federal Works Administrator; Col. O. M. Biggar, chairman of the Canadian section of the Joint Defense Board; Thomas H. MacDonald, United States Commissioner of Public Roads; Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska; a large delegation from the Vancouver, British Columbia, Board of Trade; and Frederic Adrian Delano, former Chairman of the National Resources Board, and one of the best-known railroad experts in North America.

The longest trips made by any of these celebrities were those taken by Congressman ANGELL and Delegate DIMOND, members of the United States House of Representatives. They traveled all the way from Whitehorse to Dawson Creek.

"The use of busses on the Alaska Highway," said General O'Connor this week, "has proven a useful and important innovation. These busses have transported thousands of troops and construction workers on a daily service which has demonstrated the practicability of the Alaska Highway as an artery of travel."

Jean Louis Coudert, Catholic Bishop of the Yukon and Prince Rupert, recently declared that the presence of the busses on the Alaska Highway was a unique sight in the far north. "Strangers cannot realize how remarkable this is," he said. "I now can travel in a comfortable bus to reach parishioners who formerly I had to visit by such primitive and rigorous methods of travel as dogsleds, canoe, and on foot. The construction of the Alaska Highway has worked many phenomenal changes in the North."

APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 722 OF INTERNAL REVENUE ACT

Mr. COOPER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3; and agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
WESLEY E. DISNEY,
HAROLD KNUSTON,
DANIEL A. REED,

Managers on the part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
ALLEN W. BARKLEY,
ARTHUR VANDENBERG,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3363) submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: These amendments retain the basic principles of the House provisions with respect to interest on deficiencies and overpayments but make certain technical and substantive changes. They provide that any portion of a deficiency in excess-profits tax which constitutes a deficiency because of a tax deferment under section 710 (a) (5), and any portion of a deficiency in tax under chapter I which is determined by the Commissioner to exceed any refund or credit of excess-profits tax arising from the operation of section 722 shall bear interest. They also make certain technical changes in the House bill so as to provide for the appropriate application of the interest provisions of the bill in case of an overpayment resulting from the application of an unused excess-profits credit carry-over or carry-back attributable to an increase in the excess-profits credit due to the operation of section 722 with respect to the taxable year in which the unused excess-profits credit arose. In the case of unused excess-profits credit carry-backs the provisions of the bill and the provisions of section 3771 (e) of the code (relating to the period for interest on carry-backs) are to be applied coordinately. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: This section does not appear in the House bill. It extends the time to December 31, 1944, within which pension, stock-bonus, profit-sharing, and annuity plans may be amended to meet the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the code. It also provides that for a plan to comply with the statute any provisions adopted by December 31, 1944, shall be made effective for all purposes as of a date not later than January 1, 1944, or the effective date of the plan in case of a plan becoming effective after January 1, 1944. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment, which did not appear in the House bill, broadens section 124 (f) (3) of the code so as to extend the time within which a corporation may file an application for a certificate of necessity with respect to emergency facilities completed or acquired after June 10, 1940. Under existing law such application must be filed before the expiration of 6 months after the beginning of construction, reconstruction, erection or installation, or the date of acquisition, of such facility, or before December 1, 1940, whichever is the later. The amendment substitutes April 22, 1943, for December 1, 1940. The Senate recedes.

ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
WESLEY E. DISNEY,
HAROLD KNUSTON,
DANIEL A. REED,

Managers on the part of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. DOUGLAS (at the request of Mr. COLE of New York), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. BULWINKLE, for 7 legislative days, on account of official and personal business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very timely and enlightening editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News recently on lend-lease.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 16, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 8 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Monday and Tuesday, November 15 and 16, 1943, beginning at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 49 and H. R. 2328, to amend section 18 of the Criminal Code relative to the mailing of certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings, etc.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The meeting of the subcommittee on H. R. 3140 scheduled for Tuesday, November 16, has been postponed, subject to further notice.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, November 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 182, to create the War Shipping Field Service.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

913. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 22, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Platte River, Colo., Wyo., and Nebr., with a view to determining whether any modification should be made with respect to flood control on Bear Creek, Colo., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on June 16, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 356); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

914. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the Seventh Congressional District

of the State of Illinois, James C. Moreland against Leonard W. Schuetz (H. Doc. No. 357); to the Committee on Elections No. 3, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 338. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3377, a bill to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from \$40 to \$50 per month, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 861). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Second intermediate report of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies. House Resolution 102. Resolution establishing a select committee to investigate acts of executive agencies beyond the scope of their authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 862). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 339. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3356, a bill to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 863). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 3670. A bill to provide for promotion of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio:

H. R. 3671. A bill to incorporate the Navy Fathers' Club of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3672. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Thirty-second Division; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 3673. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3674. A bill for the relief of William E. Widby; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3550. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 32 members and adherents of the New Bedford (Pa.) Presbyterian Church, urging the passage of all bills now before the House to prohibit the advertisement of alcoholic beverages, to ban beer and liquor sales at military and naval centers, to make it unlawful to furnish alcoholic beverages to anyone in uniform, and to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3551. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of John W. Fishback, and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3552. Also, petition of George Wilhelm and 21 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3553. Also, petition of Laura J. Crecelius and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3554. Also, petition of Paul Wendt and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3555. Also, petition of Herman E. Heberer and 115 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3556. By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio: Petition of Eva Brooks and 77 other members of the First Christian Church and Bible School of Barnesville, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3557. Also, petition of Barbara Ault and 29 other residents of Barnesville, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3558. Also, petition of Mary Wilson and 73 other members of the First Christian Church and Bible School of Barnesville, Ohio, urging passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3559. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from W. S. Lawrence, of Fairfield, Ill., urging that all possible reinforcements be sent to General MacArthur at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1943

(Legislative day of Friday, November 12, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whose hands are all the souls of men, we thank Thee that Thou whose glory flames from the uttermost star dost dwell also in humble and contrite hearts. Our pettiness is shamed in the light of Thy greatness. Even as we come bringing our partisanship and our national loyalties we know in our heart of hearts that we cannot pray unless we say "Our Father." Before the altar of the one God of all mankind we bow, without the masks of our self-seeking, confessing that the walls we have built and the social life we have accepted and defended have betrayed

and denied the brotherhood of the race. The bitter fruit that now we taste is of our sowing. The righteous judgments of Thine eternal order sorely chasten us. We have broken Thy law of love and our disobedience has broken us and our world.

In contrition we would dedicate anew this dear land, given us by God, to a purer life, a more unselfish devotion to the ideals which have made it great and the hope of the downtrodden, and to a deeper loyalty to the dreams of the world's Christ for all men. We ask it in the name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, November 15, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Andrews	George	Reed
Austin	Gerry	Reynolds
Ball	Gillette	Robertson
Bankhead	Green	Scrugham
Barbour	Guffey	Shipstead
Barkley	Gurney	Smith
Bilbo	Hatch	Stewart
Brewster	Hawkes	Taft
Bridges	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Hill	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Holman	Tobey
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Butler	Kilgore	Tydings
Byrd	Langer	Vandenberg
Capper	Lucas	Van Nuys
Caraway	McClellan	Wagner
Chavez	McFarland	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wheeler
Connally	Maybank	Wherry
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Moore	Wiley
Downey	O'Daniel	Willis
Eastland	Overton	Wilson
Ellender	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] are absent because of illness.